

# The Classical Review

MARCH 1889.

A DISCUSSION BETWEEN  
PROFESSOR HENRY SIDGWICK AND THE LATE PROFESSOR JOHN GROTE,  
ON THE UTILITARIAN BASIS OF PLATO'S *REPUBLIC*.

[We have to thank Prof. Sidgwick and the representatives of Prof. Grote for allowing us to print the interesting papers which follow. They were written in May, 1866, shortly before the death of the latter, in reference to the criticism of the '*Republic*' contained in George Grote's '*Plato*'; ch. 34, Vol. III. pp. 122 foll.]

Subject—WHAT IS ΔΙΚΑΙΟΣΥΝΗ, AND WHY SHOULD WE PRACTISE IT?

Interlocutors—THRASYMACHUS, ADEIMANTUS, GLAUCON, GEORGE GROTE, SOCRATES.<sup>1</sup>

Says Thrasymachus<sup>2</sup>: Justice is consulting the advantage of others to our own disadvantage, and therefore there is *no* reason why we should practise it if we can avoid doing so; in fact we should be fools and even slavish to practise it; and so people in their hearts will think about us, though they will be glad, for their own sakes, to see us do it, and therefore with their mouths will praise and encourage us.

Says Adeimantus<sup>3</sup> to Socrates: Without going so far as Thrasymachus, do you not think there is *some* truth in what he says? Without troubling ourselves as to what people think in their hearts, we value the good character and reputation which we gain by justice: we see that virtue, as a rule, is a good speculation, and honesty the best policy, and so we are willing to act for the advantage of others to our own disadvantage, aware that this disadvantage will result in future advantage. Do you not then agree in substance with Thrasymachus, and think that it is the resulting good reputation which, except when we act from fear of punishment, is the reason, and the only reason, why we should practise justice? True, Thrasymachus thinks the acting with a

view to this hollow reputation a mean thing, something a true man, an Archelaus, a Henry VIII., a Danton, will be above, and you do not. But supposing I knew somehow as to my particular case that I should gain no reputation and no good result for myself from practising justice, but that, through people's mistake, it would lead to exactly the opposite results—is there any reason *then* why I should practise it?

Says Mr. Grote<sup>4</sup>: Look at it in a commercial light. I know our friend Socrates agrees with me<sup>5</sup> that societies of men are founded on mutual wants and mutual services, which lead to what we call rights and duties: if you want your rights, you must perform your duties: and if you act justly to others, they will act justly to you: you will be done by as you do: and this is the reason why you should practise justice. Being justly treated is the 'natural consequence' of treating others justly.

Interrupts Thrasymachus<sup>6</sup>: Are you sure of that? I should say the reverse: if men see that you act justly in every case and as a rule, then they will act unjustly, not justly, to you, for they know they will get no harm by it: the persons whom they will

<sup>1</sup> The first part of the dialogue till Glaucon breaks in is by John Grote.

<sup>2</sup> Grote's *Plato*, p. 33 &c.

<sup>3</sup> *Ib.* p. 39 &c.

NO. XXII. VOL. III.

<sup>4</sup> Grote's *Plato*, pp. 137, 138, 139 &c.

<sup>5</sup> *Ib.* p. 138, also p. 47.

<sup>6</sup> *Ib.* p. 36.

act justly to are the unjust, of whom they are afraid.

You hold, that is, says Adeimantus, that our friend Mr. Grote's view comes only to a sort of ready-money justice. Here am I acting for your advantage because, and in so far as, you are acting for mine. I will give no trust, and you will be a fool if you do, for as soon as people see you are acting for their advantage beyond what they are being paid for, they will, as the phrase is, *take advantage of you*, without thought of returning it. So that your temporary disadvantage will *not* be your ultimate advantage. In reality there goes to commerce an element which Mr. Grote has not noticed—mutual trust and fidelity. Besides that the parallel between justice and commerce is not complete. Whatever the amount of a man's foresight of the consequences, he should be just. If in commerce he know, somehow, that owing to the character perhaps of the other party he will not get the value of what he gives, he need not give it. But he must practise his justice on *trust* that people will be just to him, without waiting to see whether they are. And my question to Socrates was in effect: supposing a man has reason to know this trust will be abused, and that he will meet, for his justice, with treatment from men exactly opposite to what Mr. Grote calls the 'natural consequence' of justice, is there still reason why he should practise it?

Says Socrates: There is, and the main reason of all. I do not say, and never said, but that a good reason for practising justice may be the reputation and praise that it brings—one kind of natural consequence: nor again but that another good reason may be that in practising it we are taking our part in the general commerce of mutual service among men, and may fairly expect to receive service from those whom we have served—another natural consequence: nor again but that another good reason may be that which Thrasymachus thinks a reason against it, that it is for the advantage of others. Mr. Grote accuses me of putting by this, and leaving it for Christian times (my own view being, he thinks, merely self-regarding), but<sup>1</sup> I think not fairly, if you consider how I have supposed each member of my state to live for every other member of it, and most especially the highest members to live for the benefit of the multitude, which latter are but little capable of so living for others. But none of them is, taken by itself, the main reason why we should practise

<sup>1</sup> Grote's *Plato*, p. 131, 132.

justice or virtue: nor does any of them give the true advantage which we derive from practising it, and which countervails the disadvantage. We, that is not our body with its appetites only, but our whole being, are of more consequence to ourselves than anything else is to us, and we cannot help speaking of our better selves and our worse selves, our higher selves and our lower selves, our worthier selves and our meaner selves, when we think of the various things which we feel and desire: we sometimes feel inclined to do things for which we should hate and despise ourselves, and again the reverse. Now the reason why we should practise justice, right-doing, virtue, is because, in so doing, we are acting with or from our better and higher selves, and with a certain degree of restraint of and triumph over the lower, and it is impossible to conceive anything more properly called 'our own advantage' than this. What is *we*? Not merely ourselves as capable of happiness, but ourselves altogether: the disadvantage to our lower selves (the 'epithymetic' multitude) which goes with our acting (in justice) to the advantage of others, is really a greater advantage to us altogether than would be the advantage to our lower selves arising from our taking the opposite course.

In introducing, as Mr. Grote has done, the word 'happiness,' and saying that after all I do not go beyond 'self-regard,' Mr. Grote has at least travelled quite away from my thought. The word 'happiness' only causes ambiguity where it is introduced. To anticipate another generation of philosophy, 'beatus' and 'in voluptate' are two different notions, and 'happiness' may be made to mean either of them. I will say, if you like it, 'it is well' with the just man under all circumstances: but there is no confinement to self-regard in that. His being 'self-sufficient' is no notion of mine: it is a term as ambiguous as his being 'happy.' With me the main point of consequence in regard of a man is what he is in character, and what, morally, he does: not how much or how little he feels of happiness: this must be what Mr. Grote calls my making a man self-sufficient for his own happiness. And I think that unless the fathers of families teach their children this, as much as or more than the lesson that 'honesty or justice is the best policy,' justice is not likely to be practised. Mutual justice, or the commerce of good actions, which is the main happiness of societies and of their members, cannot exist unless individual justice is practised; and individual justice

is a virtue, an individual excellence, which we must teach and cultivate in the individual at any rate not merely by telling him that it is something he will be rewarded for. Parents should teach their children that they should be as anxious to do what is just, as the other party is to have it done to him, and in the same immediate manner, without ulterior views: the act of justice being one which is at once for the advantage of both parties: to the doer as an exercise or putting forth of his better self against a lower and unworthier: to the other party as a receiving, in whatever way, his right.

I think Mr. Grote<sup>1</sup> is taking a leaf out of Thrasy-machus's book when he says that I preach what I think useful or what should be, not however believing it myself, or at least, when I theorize, speaking quite differently. And he may take his answer from Thrasy-machus. It seems to me a matter at least as much to be questioned whether 'the fathers of families,' and the large number of people who teach their children that honesty is the best policy, really believe themselves what they teach, as it is whether I believe what I teach. At least their children often suspect them. The whole world is in a conspiracy, says Thrasy-machus, to teach *others* that virtue is useful to the practiser though nobody believes it for himself; and Mr. Grote applies the same way of thinking when he says that the teaching virtue to be valuable in itself is merely preachment for a good purpose, with no belief on the part of the preacher. Both Thrasy-machus and Mr. Grote seem here overthrowing, I should say, all moral philosophy. Mr. Grote's use of the term 'preaching' makes all moral education, all attempt on the part of any one to raise morally others or another, something merely conventional and hollow. All education, as well as all moral philosophy, takes account of something more than fact, takes account, in some way, of an *ideal*: the father forms in his mind his ideal of the best life for his son, and tries to produce it: I form my ideal of the best life for man, and 'preach' that. Mr. Grote's use of the term 'preaching' seems to me to imply a notion on his part that all attempt to raise or improve human nature is humbug, and with this notion I think he need not have troubled himself to criticize me: it is but going a step lower to think with Thrasy-machus that all human society is a humbug, in which everybody is preaching to others and trying to shirk practising himself.

But remember that I do not want to

<sup>1</sup> Grote's *Plato*, p. 156, 158.

depreciate justice as Mr. Grote views it, as a mutual and regulated interchange of benefit or service. Mr. Grote, going beyond Thrasy-machus, allows people to see the benefit of this, and to believe in each other as seeing it, so that, independent of the prospect of a particular or *quid pro quo* return, there is willingness on a man's part to do something not for himself, to give up something for others. I want him to allow that this frame of mind is in itself an advantage to the man who possesses it, whether or not the return, which, in Mr. Grote's language, is the natural consequence of it, comes or not. This seems to me morality. I form an ideal of what a man should be, and the man who has this frame of mind seems to me to come more up to it than the man who has not. If Mr. Grote says, We will have no ideals, we will keep to the practical: I think what he will come to is not *his* morality, but Thrasy-machus's. It is ideals and moral 'preaching' which have brought human society so far as it has been brought.

<sup>2</sup> *Glaucon*:—I am truly glad, Socrates, that you have deviated so far from your usual habit as to make a long speech and to tell us your own opinions. But for myself, you have just now made me feel that I was but a botcher, in an art in which, from your praise, I fancied that I had attained some excellence.

*Socrates*:—What art, my friend?

*Glaucon*:—In cleansing and polishing the types of men so that justice and injustice might appear unmixed, each in its own embodiment.

*Socrates*:—And what alien element then did you omit to scour away?

*Glaucon*:—Truly a very thick, it appears, and penetrating incrustation of happiness. For we took away, you remember, from the just man, not merely the vulgar and external goods, as men deem them, such as wealth and pleasure and fortune, but also the love of friends, the respect of living men, and the praises of posterity: but we left him all the peace and satisfaction that a man may derive from the harmony of his internal commonwealth, each division of his soul doing its own business.

*Socrates*:—We did.

*Glaucon*:—Not foreseeing that a subtle connoisseur in this art would point out that such a man shows forth not the naked beauty of justice, but justice clothed, as it were, in an ample robe of self-satisfaction;

<sup>2</sup> What follows is by H. Sidgwick as far as the break, p. 100. The remainder is by John Grote.

so that it may be said that he loves justice not for her own sake, but for the sake of this rich mantle of happiness.

<sup>1</sup>\**Socrates*:—So the severe connoisseurs said.

*Glaucon*:—But you, nobly coming to the rescue, asserted that this kind of happiness was not more essential than that other of wealth and reputation to make men love justice: saying that all these kinds of happiness did really fall to the lot of the just man and encourage him: but yet that he was originally just, from no calculation of happiness but because he felt it was 'well for him' to be so though he were in no way happy.

*Socrates*:—So I think, but I may seem to others mistaken.

*Glaucon*:—Not, at least, my eloquent friend, to us who are called lovers of justice. For to a lover you know no praise of his mistress can seem extravagant.\* But can we contrive then in the figure that we before imagined to separate from justice this internal happiness?

*Socrates*:—It is difficult, for perhaps they are bound together by nature.

*Glaucon*:—But we profess to be skilled in separating the things most firmly wedded in order to see better what each is in itself. Let us then imagine that our just man is afflicted with some grievous heaven-sent disease, perpetually clinging to his body and crushing out the satisfaction arising from the harmony of the soul, so that he cannot feel it even for a moment; or if you in your chivalrous defence of the soul should refuse to admit that she can ever be so entirely under the influence of the body, let us suppose a man (as we have indeed heard of such) who, having trodden unwittingly on the sacred soil of some god, has been smitten in the wrath of this god, though from no conscious fault of his own, with a marvellous melancholy, covering his soul as a black storm-cloud covers the sky, so that he would willingly slay himself every hour, but that he knows it to be an offence against Zeus—is the lot of such a man, think you, if he be perfectly just, to be preferred to that of an unjust man free from this plague? and can we teach our children so?

*Socrates*:—Both you and I have been wrong, Glaucon, for the last five minutes, both as to what we have said and as to the manner of our saying it. You forgot, when you implied that I was out of character in making a long speech, and I forgot, when I

<sup>2</sup> The asterisks here and below are explained further on.

continued the conversation with you in that tone, that we are not now individual men living at Athens, but commentators on (or explainers of) our former selves, living, or supposed to live, in A.D. 1866. In what I said before I merely expressed in a matter-of-fact way what I had to say; but for the last five minutes we have been talking as we used to talk. I now do not admire our old way of talking as much as I did: for though beautiful in art, I think it has sometimes misled us in argument: just at this moment, for instance, I see what we both mean, but I do not think we have put it quite clearly.

*Glaucon*:—How?

*Socrates*:—In this way. You have made a certain connoisseur actually say what just before you said with reason he might say; and then you have made me say in answer to him what I did not say (or have I forgot?) and what I do not think I should exactly say, though I might say something like it. I think the argument will stand clearer if we suppose unsaid what we both said from<sup>2</sup> 'So the severe' to 'extravagant,' and go on from 'mantle of happiness' to 'Can we contrive' because then I will say, in answer to what you say afterwards, something partly like, partly different from, what you have attributed to me.

*Glaucon*:—Very well, let us suppose so.

*Socrates*:—Perhaps after all I have been unfair to you, because in our old dialogue I might have been inclined to say, and perhaps in consistency ought to have said, what I am now rather disclaiming. The last thing which you have said so eloquently is in reality a supplement to what I said in the *Republic*, and is of the greatest importance, even necessary to its completeness. I ought then to have made the supposition as to the stroke from the gods, which you have now made. To see justice entirely naked we must strip her (*if only we can*) of self-satisfaction: we must strip off not only the first coat of the natural consequences of justice, which is success and wealth, and the second which is the approbation of men, but the third, which is our own self-approbation. But observe what I say: 'if only we can.' It is so long ago that I will not say whether I thought of this reservation at the time, and therefore did not make this supposition. The other coats will come off: will this? Everything about it which is what I may call 'circumstantial' will come off—all distinct self-congratulation or pleasure arising from the dwelling on the thought of what we have done or are doing: our soul may be

<sup>2</sup> See asterisks above.



covered, as you well say, with a black storm-cloud: imagine one of those martyrs who have lived since my time—and I dare say it was the case with some of them—struggling with doubt even at the stake, doubting whether he was right or whether he was not after all a fool. Still, take away all distinct self-satisfaction, I think there is something you cannot take away. Remember we are supposing the man to *do* the just action, to make up his mind to do it because, under whatever mental clouds and difficulties, he thinks it is just. Now when a man thinks a thing is just, and does it because it is so, it seems that there is a satisfaction attending this which is perfectly intimate to it, which is not part of the dress of the action, but part of the action itself—of justice in this case. If the man does the thing of his own will, and because he approves of it as the thing to be done, this is a satisfaction of mind which I will not try to measure with more deliberate self-congratulation, but which seems to me the nucleus of this and source of its brightness. And you cannot take away *this* satisfaction so long as you leave the supposition that it is the man himself who does the action. If the gods have so far beclouded the man's mind as to take away from him not only the self-congratulation which is the natural accompaniment of doing a just action, but the recognition of the action as just, which involves in the virtuous man a satisfaction in doing it, then the only consequence will be that he will not do the action—since he only does it because he thinks it is just—we have destroyed our supposition. He will do something else—the thing which the gods in their darkening his mind have led him to think is just—and all that we are now saying will not apply.

I think then that the supposition of the absence of self-satisfaction in a good man doing a good action is one which can be only partially made, though to make it in that partial degree is a proper supplement to the suppositions which we did make. There is sometimes what may be called a spiritual luxury in suffering: remove all this. There is a triumph in opposing a determined self-will against *any* pain. Suppose the sufferer not strong and firm-minded like this, but the opposite. Still, make what suppositions you will, if you consider the man to do the action because he thinks it is just, there is a satisfaction in the doing it which you cannot take away, leaving him his will and independence. This satisfaction is a part not of the dress but of the skin or flesh of justice,

and may I not say it is worth to the man all the dress put together?

*Glaucon* :—I think I agree with you, Socrates, and see that the supposing the just man deprived of all such self-satisfaction as *can* be taken away, in addition to his being deprived of others' approbation, does not alter such force as there was in the arguments which we formerly used in the *Republic*. And of course we must not suppose that the gods make him cease to be a good man: could we suppose them to do so, then he would only cease to act justly, and what we are saying would have no bearing. But tell me what you think of something I am now going to say.

*Socrates* :—What is it?

*Glaucon* :—This. Our supposing the man deprived, so far as it is possible, of self-comfort and self-satisfaction, which are so very natural and probable consequences of just doing, brings home to me strongly how exceedingly exceptional is our supposition altogether of the man practising justice and receiving none of the beneficial consequences of it. Is there any use in making such an exceptional supposition, and is it not better to say that such extreme cases we really cannot form an opinion about? We however in the *Republic* did not treat the supposition as exceptional or extreme: we came to the conclusion that, as a regular thing, whatever extrinsic advantage might come to the doer of justice from his doing it, the main advantage to him would consist in his own state in doing it: now however, by our last supposition, we are shaking that state itself; and though we have not overthrown it, we have much restricted and limited it: though we have left still a nucleus of what might be called happiness, we have multiplied in supposition the accompanying materials of unhappiness to a very great extent. Are we true to fact in considering this in any way the normal state of things about justice? When we come to consider as a part of the dress of justice a considerable portion of our own natural satisfaction in being just, should we not consider that it is the nature of justice to be dressed, and that in stripping her as we have done we have done an act of violence to her, an extreme thing?

*Socrates* :—I think you are right, and that, by the last supposition we made, the truth about the whole matter, and about my difference of opinion with Mr. Grote, is a good deal brought out. I do not deny that worldly success and the approbation of men are the natural consequences of doing justly,

i.e. the consequences likely to follow it, unless there is some hindrance, say e.g. the state of society. He does not, I presume, deny that there is an inward self-wholeness, self-satisfaction, which we may call happiness, felt in the doing justly; and though he may not agree with what I said just now as to its being at bottom universal, he would probably allow that it was a more natural and constant accompaniment on the doing justly than even success or men's approbation was. Our difference is, then, that I make this latter (the mental state or feeling) the all-important thing about justice to us, or all-important accompaniment of justice with us; he, on the other side, charges me with making too little of the natural consequences of justice in the way of worldly success and men's approbation. I may have made too little of them; but still I think I was right in saying that the fathers of families should bring up their children rather to love justice for itself than to love it on account of these. I may be open to Mr. Grote's criticism as suggesting a wrong notion of human society by leading people to forget about these natural consequences of justice as if there

were no such things, and to think only about their own state and feeling as their motive and reason for doing justly: the truth, putting all things, idea and fact, together, may lie rather between him and me; but I think it lies nearest to my side.

*Glaucón* :—Yes, and I think it does also in regard of the question of the improvement of society. Mr. Grote, in making credit and the approbation of men so important a natural consequence of justice as he does, is brought in face of the question that this consequence will not follow on doing justly except in a tolerably good state of society. Here appears a fundamental difference between his way of thinking and yours. You have given us what you conceive a perfect society, could we have it; but in the meantime you make a man's doing justly depend on himself, and not on the approbation of other men in our actual societies. Mr. Grote makes it very much to depend on this, and yet he has not a favourable idea of our actual societies: he conceives that in order to get a true doing of justice by individuals we must have better societies or a better general opinion.

#### NOTES AND EMENDATIONS ON AESCHYLUS SEPT. C. THEBAS (I).

I HAVE considered that the following notes on Aeschylus *Sept. c. Theb.* might be most opportunely offered while Mr. Verrall's original and conscientious work draws special attention to that difficult play. I trust Mr. Verrall will pardon one who has been for some few years making a special study of Aeschylus *hand passibus aequis* for differing from him upon some of the more important passages. Some indulgence may perhaps also be claimed for a student who has not immediately to his hand the literary appliances and periodical criticism of Europe.

17-20. ἡ γὰρ νέους ἔρποντας εὐμενὶ πῆδω  
ἀπαντα πανδοκοῦσα παιδείας ὄλυν  
ἐθρέψατ' οἰκιστῆρας ἀσπιδηφόρους  
πιστούς, ὅπως γένουσθε πρὸς χρέος τόδε.

With this reading (kept by Mr. Verrall) there are two main causes of dissatisfaction: (1) the excessive weakness of *γένουσθε* in the sense desired; whence the scholiast and editors have preferred to suppose a most involved construction; (2) the isolation of the metaphor in *πανδοκοῦσα*, which makes it

by no means dignified; while, if we understand *ἐρποντας* and *γένουσθε* of *plants*, the mixture of metaphors (i.e. the transition from acting as hostess to nurturing plants, and amid this the literal *οἰκιστῆρας ἀσπιδηφόρους*) is surely impossible.

I find in the passage that the Earth is a hostess receiving *travellers* (hence *ἐρποντας*) in a hospitable (*εὐμενὶ*) inn (the *πανδοκοῖον* being *πῆδον*). But such professional hostesses require *payment* for maintenance (cf. inf. 477, *θανὸν τροφέα πληρώσει χθονί*). While the guests are young she *gives credit* (hence *πιστούς*, *πίστις* being often = the *fides* of commercial transactions). Moreover *χρέος* is a *debt*, and frequently has that meaning in places where it is carelessly rendered as = *χρῆμα* [e.g. in *Suppl.* 472, *εἰ μὲν γὰρ ὑμῖν μὴ τόδ' ἐκπράξω χρέος*, where it would be a literary blemish to use *χρέος* as merely = *rem*, and *ἐκπράξω* as merely = *perfecero*, when, at least in combination, they so clearly suggest *debitum exegero*, 'collect the payment of this obligation'].

Since then *πανδοκοῦσα*, *ἐθρέψατο*, *πιστούς*, *χρέος* cumulatively prove a transaction in

which credit is given for a debt due to the hostess of an inn; and since *γένουισθε* is utterly inadequate, I believe ΓΕΝΟΙΘΕ to be a mistake for ΤΕΛΟΙΘΕ (*τελοῖσθε*). This corruption is of the commonest, e.g. Hdt. II. 64, *ὀρνίθων τέλεα* has the variant *γένεα*, and in *Suppl.* 631, *εὐκταῖα γένη χειούσας*, we should restore *τέλη*, with a play on the sense of *τέλη* = *χοαί*.

*τελοῖσθε* is passive 'that ye might be given in payment,' i.e. that you might pay her in your own lives, cf. v. 477. Thus, 'She, with her hospitable soil serving as hostess to you when you came to her inn in your childhood, gave you maintenance, and brought you up to be founders and shieldbearers in whom she trusted (i.e. giving you credit, or, if *πιστοῖς* be active, it comes to the same effect), to the end that ye might be paid (i.e. that your bodies and lives might be the pay), to meet the debt which now falls due.'

And under this signification there runs throughout, *more Aeschyleo*, the other set of meanings, 'brought you up, so that ye might come to maturity to meet this present matter—being *trusty* shieldmen.'

48. ἡ γῆν θανόντες τήνδε φυράσειν φόνω.

Mr. Verrall says *τήνδε* is 'superfluous.' Rather, I find it emphatic. If they cannot take the city they will never leave this place alive, but will perish in the attempt, *here and now*.

100. πάταγος οὐχ ἐνὸς δορός.

Mr. Verrall's objection is one of which many will feel the force. His own clever conjecture is however, scarcely convincing. In the passage *Rhes.* 792 the expression *κενὴ δορός*, as used of a *hand*, is entirely appropriate. But applied to *πάταγος* it strikes me as neither natural nor Aeschylean. I had noted down *πάταγος ΟΥCYXNOC δορός*, i.e. *πάταγος οὐ συχνὸς δορός*: 'is there not much clashing of the spear?' The loss of either *ΟΥ* or *CY* would be most natural.

180. ψῆφος κατ' αὐτῶν ὀλεθρία βουλεύεται.

In answer to Mr. Verrall's arguments it may be urged: (1) that a king with the authority and temper of Eteocles is not likely to refer such a matter to a council (supposing a council to exist at all); (2) that this is no time for such deliberation, but for immediate action.

*Λευστήρα δῆμον* = *δημόλευστον*, with emphasis, not on the political position of the

*δῆμος*, but on the public vengeance of the execution.

The true reading was, I think, *βεβλήσεται*, the paulo-post future being excellently fitted to express the *immediate* execution of the threat. 'Forthwith shall a vote for death be cast against them.' *Βάλλειν ψῆφον* is a good poetical equivalent of *φέρειν* or *τίθεσθαι ψῆφον*, cf. *Eum.* 751.

Moreover *ὀλεθρία* gains in force, and the whole is more in keeping with character and situation than 'the question of putting them to death shall be deliberated.'

194. νεὼς καμούσης ποντίω . . . ματι.

The erasure is afterwards filled with *ἐν κί*, and the *codd. rec.* give *πρὸς κόματι*.

Although of course there is a multitude of possible ways of filling the gap (e.g. *συγκρούσματι* might be suggested), it would seem from the word *καμούσης* 'having fallen sick,' and from the necessity of finding a due significance (i.e. a defining epithetic significance) in *ποντίω*, that Aeschylus really wrote *σὺν τραύματι*.

It is scarcely necessary to illustrate the use of *τιτρώσκω* and *τραῦμα* (Hdt. vi. 16) of disabled ships (cf. *ἀκείόμενος*).

202—204. These three lines certainly belong to Eteocles, like the preceding and the four following sets of three. But is the second line rightly translated? Surely *πρὸς θεῶν* = 'to the gods' advantage.'

'Why, will not that be to the interest of the gods? Nay (of course it will, for) when a town is taken, it is said that the gods (are obliged also to) abandon it.' Or, to put it in a vulgar way, 'the gods of a captured city *have to quit*'—'you may therefore rely upon the gods.'

*ἐκλιπεῖν* because Eteocles does not choose to use an offensive term like *ἐκπεσεῖν* or even *ἀναστήναι*, although the meaning is the same.

247. λέγοις ἂν ὡς τάχιστα, καὶ τάχ' εἴσομαι.

To say nothing of the word *τάχα* after ὡς *τάχιστα*, it seems scarcely a decent answer for subjects to make to a king, or indeed to any person in authority, 'speak and I will see.'

*Codd. Rec.* give *τάχ' εἴσομαι*.

Moreover in v. 249, as soon as Eteocles says *σίγησον*, the chorus replies *σιγῶ*. This is indeed 'seeing' quickly! Remembering how incessantly *ι* and *η*, *θ* and *ε* are confounded, we may almost certainly restore *TAXΘHCOMAI* (*ταχθήσομαι*)—'Speak and I will obey, will be disciplined.'

The sense of all the passage vv. 242 *sqq.* is, I think, quite misunderstood in the latest edition. *παλινστομείς* cannot = *δυσφημείς*. The whole runs:

Er. O Zeus, what a stock didst thou create in women!

Cho. A pitiable one—like men, if their city be taken.

Er. Ah! do you retort, on the strength of your hold upon the images?

Cho. (Forgive me), for through faint-heartedness fear runs away with my tongue.

Er. (It were well if you would = perhaps you will be good enough to) allow my request to have *authority* (cf. *οἱ ἐν τέλει*) *without ado* (*κοῦφον* i.e. without putting me to the trouble of compulsion).

Cho. Say on. I will be disciplined.

Er. Be silent then, &c.

256. *θάροςος φίλοις λύνουσα*, &c.

We have here one more instance of the evil effect of the unfortunate shape of the uncial K, which is incessantly confounded with K. In the final IC of *φιλοIC* is lost the initial K of *κλύουσι*, the dative participle belonging to *φίλοις*, 'to our friends, when they hear it.'

259. *οὐδ' ἀπ' Ἰσμηνοῦ λέγω*.

Mr. Verrall gives *οὐδαρ'*. I cannot feel convinced that the tragedians used 'local' forms in dialogue. Aristophanes might introduce dialectical peculiarities in the mouths of foreigners, but it would be desirable to have some *certain* illustrations before we admit into tragedy forms which would, one feels, have been laughable—so much so, indeed, as would be an Irish pronunciation, if introduced into an English tragedy simply because the scene lay in Ireland. Moreover would Aeschylus *define* the fount of Dirce? And if he did so, would he define it as 'the waters of Ismenus?'

The proper emendation is, I think, to be looked for in the consideration that Dirce was specially used for *drinking* purposes (v. for instance v. 295, *ἔδωρ Διρκαῖον, εὐτραφέστατον πομάτων*), and Ismenus for *bathing* purposes (v. Eur. *Phoen.* 341, *ἀνυμέναια δ' Ἰσμηνος ἐκηδέυθη*—the sense requires *ἐχηρείυθη*—*λουτροφόρου χλιδᾶς*).

What then if Aeschylus wrote *λουτραία τ' Ἰσμηνοῦ*?

271. *εἰς ἐπτατειχῆς ἐξόδους τάξω*.

It is hard to believe that the adjective really can mean 'the seven (portals) of the

wall.' Can it mean anything else but 'provided with seven walls?'

When so many editors have passed it by, one is timid in suggesting that after all the poet wrote—

*εἰς ἐπτατειχους ἐξόδους*

where *τειχους ἐξόδους* = *πύλας*.

368. *μεσημβριναῖς κλαγγαῖσιν ὡς δράκων βοᾷ*.

That a *δράκων* does not *βοᾶν* is indisputable, and Aeschylus knew it well. And even if *βοᾶν* could be used (as it cannot) of *hissing*, *κλαγγαῖσιν* is quite out of the question. Hartung, who rightly reads *ΑΥΓΑΙCIN* (*αὐγαῖσιν*), to which the final IC of *μεσημβριναIC* adhered in the shape of K, keeps *βοᾷ*.

I do but tread in Mr. Verrall's steps when I suggest that our dictionaries should be supplied with a lost verb *θοᾶν*, answering to *θοάζων* as *ματᾶν* to *ματάζειν* (cf. *θοῶ*). Such a verb, formed analogously to verbs like *τομᾶν*, *ναυτιᾶν*, and others of complaints and affections, is distinctly appropriate, viz. 'to be restively inclined.' With *μαργῶν* it goes well, and it does excellently express the state of a snake in the heat of noon, as we Australians abundantly know.

The same verb must be similarly restored in v. 379—

*βοᾷ παρ' ὄχθαις ποταμίας μαχῆς ἐρῶν ἵππος χαλινῶν ὡς κατασθμαίνων μένει*.

A horse *θοᾷ* under such circumstances, not *βοᾷ*. Yet once more in v. 499, of the horses who strain in their headbands—

*θελούσας πρὸς πύλαις πεπτωκῆναι*,

we should restore *θούσας* in place of the feeble *θελούσας*.

372. *ὑπ' ἀσπίδος δ' ἐσὼ χαλκήλατοι κλάζουσι κώδωνες φόβον*.

Mr. Verrall's objections are complete, but his conjecture (contrary to custom) is not sufficiently close to the MSS. The sense he requires seems to be better obtained from—

*κράσπεδον δὲ τῷ κ.τ.λ.*

The bells were on a loose attachment, an edging or ornamental fringework belonging to the helmet, and would ring as he shook the plumes. *κράσπεδον* is in apposition to *κώδωνες*, 'and, as a fringe thereto. . . .'. Diodorus (18, 26) speaks of *δρακωνοῦς θύσανος* (= *κράσπεδον*) with bells attached. But whence *σώ* and the variant *τῷ*? I am inclined to believe that the former arose from an old



and true correction written over, and belonging to, the word beneath,

σὸ  
φόνον (i.e. σόβον)

σοβεῖν is a *vox propria* of a scare, and though the noun can scarcely be said to exist in our dictionaries, it was, I believe, frequent in literature, and has been ousted from many places by φόβος, e.g. Babrius xxvi. 4 (of the boy with the empty sling, frightening birds), the MSS. give

τῷ φόβῳ καταπλήσσω.

Dr. Rutterford there rightly rejects Seidler's ψόφῳ.

As a matter of taste I should prefer the Cadmean messenger to speak of the enemy's bells as 'ringing out a scare,' rather than 'a fear'—for it is empty noise.

389. τάχ' ἂν γένοιτο μάντις ἀνοία τινι.

Besides the metrical objection, which is not removed even by reading ἡ ἀνοία, there is the objection of sense, for the σῆμα in question is one of those least marked by folly, if it is at all.

By a change of one letter we get ἀντία. 'A certain one may find it a *contrary* prophetic,' i.e. of a meaning opposed to (him and) his expectations.

434. κεί στόμαργός ἐστ' ἄγαν,  
αἰθων τέτακται λῆμα.

Polyphontes the Cadmean a 'prater'! Is this a likely remark about a champion going to meet a boaster? Rather he should resemble Actor (v. 541), ἀνὴρ ἄκομπος, χεῖρ δ' ὄρᾳ τὸ δράσιμον.

Despite the universal toleration of this monstrosity, I feel sure Aeschylus wrote κεί στόμ' ἀργός, &c.

'And even if he is slow of mouth he is fiery of spirit.'

λῆμα )( στόμα. αἰθων )( ἀργός.

493. Mr. Verrall seeks an instance of *χρεία* = *χρησις* (of an oracle). The use is at least strongly suggested in Lucian, *Bio. Acc.* §792:

ὁ Ἀπόλλων ὀλίγον δὲν ἐκκεκώφωται πρὸς τῶν ἐνοχλούντων κατὰ χρεῖαν τῆς μαντικῆς—although the ordinary meaning of *χρεία* is not excluded.

502. τοιάδε μέντοι προσφιλία δαιμόνων.

Why μέντοι? Mr. Verrall is obliged to seek far for an explanation of the line, to which this 'qualification' can be adapted.

The context points however to

μὲν τοῦν (i.e. τοῦτον), dative,

'for those twain . . . .'

516. ὁμνυσι δ' αἰχμὴν ἣν ἔχει μᾶλλον θεοῦ  
σέβειν πεποιοῦσ' ὁμμάτων θ' ὑπέρτερον.

ἣν ἔχει is very weak, and even with Mr. Verrall's explanation it is hard to fathom the construction. But setting aside these objections, I find it difficult to accept any trace of fetishism. However bold it may appear, I am inclined to suggest that ἔχει μᾶλλον has arisen from *κειμήλιον*, θεοῦ being a later addition to explain the word μᾶλλον in connection with σέβειν.

ΠΕΠΟΙΘΩΣ is a mistake for ΠΕΡΙΘΩΣ, and I should read

ἣν ἔχων κειμήλιον  
σέβει περισσῶς ὁμμάτων θ' ὑπέρτερον.

533. ἐλθὼν δ' εἴκειν οὐ κατηλεύσειν μάχην,  
μακρὰς κελεύθον δ' οὐ καταισχυνεῖν πόρον

It does not appear to have been noted that the latter line involves the notion of his being an *ἐμπορος*, so that the metaphor of *κατηλεύσειν* (cf. *πανδοκοῦσα*, v. 18) is not isolated but is carried out into the (usual) contrast of *κάπηλος* and *ἐμπορος*, poetically expressed.

540. ἀνὴρ ἄκομπος, χεῖρ δ' ὁρᾷ τὸ δράσιμον.

Much more to the point, I think, is

χεῖρ δ' ἐρεῖ—

'he makes no boast, but his *hand* will do the speaking—in the way of deeds.'

549. θεῶν θελόντων δ' ἂν ἀλθβεύσαιμ' ἐγώ.

Mr. Verrall's ingenious *κατηλεύσαιμ'* must surely be a mistake. To say in 532 'he will not *κατηλεύειν μάχην*,' and to reply here with 'it is I who will *κατηλεύειν*,' and yet to attach a different (and an unparalleled) sense to the latter, does not seem to be satisfactory. That ἐγὼ answers to some threat or intention of the antagonist is clear. What was that intention? The Sphinx on the shield of Parthenopaeus (vv. 530-531) has a Cadmean for her *prey*. 'But,' says Eteocles, 'Parthenopaeus and this beast of prey will not have the future they suppose—if the gods will it is I who will do the capturing or preying.'

If we write θεῶν θελον ΤΩΝΔΑΝΑΛΗΘΕΥCαιμ' ἐγώ it will be easy to see how this arose from θεῶν θελον ΤΩΝΤΩΔΑΝΑΓΡΕΥCαιμ' ἐγώ.

i.e. *θεῶν θελόντων τῶδ' ἂν ἀγρεύσαιμ' ἐγώ.*  
'I will capture *them*, not they me.'

636. *τοιαῦτ' ἐκείνων ἐστὶ τάξευρήματα.*

Who are *ἐκείνοι*? What are their *ἐξευρήματα*? If *ἐκείνοι* are *all* the Argive champions, they come in here at a most unsuitable place; for this *ῥήσις* is dealing with Polynices and *his* *σῆμα*, just as the other *ῥήσις* have each dealt with a separate chief and his escutcheon. As far as v. 635 Polynices only is in question, and at v. 637 the question is, Who shall go against Polynices? Why then should a line be interposed relating to the chiefs generally?

And *τάξευρήματα* is no proper term for anything that Polynices and the chiefs have said or done. They boast and threaten, but they do not devise. And if it be of the *σῆματα* they have invented for themselves (a very improbable supposition), what is it doing here?

It would of course be easy to suggest *τάξανχρήματα* or *τάπειλήματα*, *vel hoc genus omne*; but these are not words likely to have been corrupted, nor would they remove the difficulty of *ἐκείνων*.

In vv. 631-635 the *σῆμα* represents *Δίκη*

leading back an exile, with a written *promise* or *pledge* of restitution. Aeschylus in all probability wrote—

*τοιαῦτ' ἐκείνοι ἐστὶ τὰ γγυρήματα.*

'Such is the compact (*cf.* vv. 646 *sqq.*), or bargain, existing between those twain'—the two on the shield.

648. *χρυσότευκτα γράμματα*  
*ἐπ' ἀσπίδος φλύοντα συμφοίτω φρενῶν.*

Mr. Verrall keeps this, and renders 'his mad pair of wanderers.' But is this possible Greek? Could *συμφοίτω φρενῶν* mean anything but *φοιτῶντε σὺν ταῖς φρεσὶν (αὐτοῦ)*, 'his mind's fellow-wanderers'?

More probably, I think, we have another instance of the frequent interchange of *οι* and *υ*, and the reading should be:

*ἐπ' ἀσπίδος φλύοντα συμφύτως φρενί*

'boasting on his shield consistently with his heart'—as boastful outwardly as inwardly, and in the boast showing the nature of his heart.'

THOS. G. TUCKER,  
Melbourne.

#### REMARKS ON SOME OF MR. TUCKER'S NOTES TO AESCH. *S.C.T.*

As my previous studies and Mr. Tucker's courteous reference to them have given me a special interest in his notes, I take the opportunity, which has been offered to me, of appending a few remarks. Under the circumstances it will be proper that I should be as concise as possible.

I mention first those suggestions which attract me at first view:

17-20. Mr. Tucker's *τελοῖσθε* gives a very good sense and is simpler than *γάνισθε*. Whether the change is desirable, seems to depend on the question whether Mr. Tucker is right in his interpretation of *ἔποντας* and *ἐθρέψατο*. Perhaps *εὐμενεί πέδω*, which he does not specially notice, does rather suggest the metaphor of rearing plants than that of entertaining strangers, and so also the voice of *ἐθρέψατο*. But it is certainly a great advantage to bring the whole metaphor into unison with *πανδοκοῦσα*.

203. *πρὸς θεῶν*. I think Mr. Tucker is right.

256. *θάρσος φίλοις κλύουσι*. This makes

a hard line perfectly easy at the expense of a minute alteration, and is extremely tempting. I still think the MS. *λύουσα* may be right, but I should not be surprised if I were alone in my opinion.

493. The reference is exactly to the point.

533. This is clearly right and should have been noted.

To take next those notes from which *prima facie* I should dissent.

On 247, I doubt the rendering of *ταχθήσομαι* by *I will be disciplined*, or *will be obedient*. Can it be illustrated? (Mr. Tucker's version of *παλινστομεῖν*, *retort*, is highly probable, as indeed I have said in my note.)

259. Mr. Tucker's *λοντρά τε* is inadmissible for the same reason as Dindorf's *ὑδαρά τε*. This use of *λέγω* necessarily, I think, in Aeschylus imports a definition, not the addition of other terms to a catalogue.—Might not a poet speak in a Scotch story of a *kirk* or the *Laigh Kirk*, a *loch* or the *Nor'loch*, and is *οἶδα*, as a mere form, any stranger than *μέσσοις*?—See also the school edition.

516. I do not apprehend the objection here. If the word *fetichism* is improper, let it be dismissed; but surely the religion of Parthenopaeus attributes some magical and peculiar power to the weapon itself, and we are to regard his opinion as savage and impious. This is what I meant. Why is ἦν ἔχει very weak? The corresponding words in the English do not seem irrelevant or inappropriate.

541. I am not satisfied that ἐπεῖ gives a better point than the MS. ὁρᾷ, or so good. The parallel of vv. 610—611 shows exactly in what sense the hand is said to 'see the possible.' Moreover a 'seeing hand' could much more easily be expressed in pictorial symbol than a 'speaking hand'; if we suppose, as I do, that the meaning of Eteokles here was actually so expressed.

636. The speaker refers to *all* the champions (ἐκείνων plural), because Polyneices is the last, and having finished his report he is about to sum up. Their 'inventions' are the decorations by which they have outwardly expressed their confidence of victory, and which fill so large a space in the report.

The question τίνα πέμπειν δοκεῖ; is no doubt not the continuation to which the previous line naturally leads up. But the speaker intended to finish with ναυκληρεῖν πόλιν. The pause and the question are prompted by the behaviour of the king and the bystanders. To smooth the connexion would injure the effect.

On the remaining notes I will not at present express any opinion. I have merely jotted some queries.—100. Is συχνός a word of poetic colour? (I have no confidence at all in οὐ κενός, and it does not appear in the school-edition by Mr. Bayfield and myself.)—271. ἐπτατειχεῖς ἐξόδους: cf. λευκοπηχεῖς χεῖρες?—549. Is the long *ā* in ἀγρεύσαιμ' satisfactory? I admit that κατηλεῖνσαιμ' is none too clear. A modified explanation of it is proposed in the school-edition.

Of course there is much of interest in the notes which I have not touched at all. The above are merely the remarks which first occur to me. I have to thank Mr. Tucker for his useful criticism.

A. W. V.

#### HORACE, ODES III. 27.

My object in writing this note is to clear up a misapprehension which detracts from the refinement and poetical beauty of what I have always considered—though many editors have disparaged it—one of the most charming odes of Horace. I have lately had to give much attention to it, and have been astonished to find how many readers and admirers of Horace are under what appears to me to be a total mistake as regards the significance of certain expressions, such as 'virginum culpa' (line 38), 'turpe commissum' and 'vitiis carentem' (line 39), 'impudens' (lines 49 and 50), 'zona te secuta' (line 59), and especially 'uxor' (line 73), which they consider to put the story of Europa on much the same footing as that of Pasiphaë.

The great Bentley (who however was more remarkable for his unapproachable scholarship than for his refinement) evidently favours the common interpretation by proposing to read 'vitiis carentem' instead of 'vitiis carentem,' on the express ground that *vitiis* = *stupro*. Orelli objects to Bentley's suggestion, but plainly takes the same view when he gives as his reason for the objection

the fact that 'hoc plurali—*vitiis*—*vitatur* nimis aperta *stupri* significatio,' and quotes, as if it were parallel, the case of Rhea Silvia. To come to more recent editors, such as Messrs. Maclean and Wickham. Among the English representatives, the two named certainly seem to incline towards the acceptance which I shall presently put forward, but while objecting to Bentley's emendation, for its indelicacy, neither of them says outright that it would be an utter misrepresentation. Yet if we consider it, not only is the whole tone of the poem opposed to such an idea, but the circumstances of the case would appear to preclude it, whether we think of the time before the passage across to Crete, or during the passage, or after the landing, since Europa is represented as having long before that repented of her rashness, and the 'monster' is evidently supposed to have vanished immediately on landing. Moreover, the words 'zona te secuta' are, to my thinking, additional proof, if any were needed, that the 'zone' had not been 'loosened.'

It is now pertinent to ask whence Horace may be supposed to have derived his version

of the legend. From Bacchylides? Perhaps; but unfortunately that poet's *Europa*, if not purely hypothetical, has not come down to us. Is there any other Greek poet whose treatment of Europa's story may have been familiar to Horace? Yes, Moschus; and his poem is within the reach of everybody, though, oddly enough, it is seldom or never mentioned as the source upon which Horace may have drawn.

Now the legend, as treated by Moschus, is entirely opposed to Bentley's view. Zeus, on the passage across to Crete, reveals himself to the repentant damsel, comforts her, promises to marry her on her arrival, and fulfils his promise:—

θάρσει, παρθενική, μὴ δέδοθαι πόντιον οἶδμα·  
αὐτὸς τοι Ζεὺς εἰμι, καὶ ἐγγύθεν εἶδομαι εἶναι  
ταῦρος..... Κρήτην δέ σε δέξεται ἥδη,  
ἣ μ' ἔθρεψε καὶ αὐτὸν, ὅπῃ νυμφῆϊα σείο  
ἔσεται· ἐξ ἐμέθεν δὲ κλυτοὺς μάλᾳ φύσεται νῆας,  
οἳ σκηπτοῦχοι ἅπασιν ἐπιχθονίοισιν ἔσονται  
ὥς φάτο· καὶ τετέλεστο τάπερ φάτο· φαίνεται μὲν  
δὴ  
Κρήτην Ζεὺς δὲ πάλιν ἐτέρην ἀνελίκετο μρρφήν·  
λύσε δέ οἱ μίτρη· καὶ οἱ λῆχος ἔντυνον Ὄρῳ·

And if anybody should think that Europa's language is too strong for the occasion, under the comparatively innocent circumstances in which she has, according to my theory, become involved, I would urge, first of all, that, from the tone of the address at the commencement of the ode, so different from that which Horace adopts towards his '*libertinae*,' '*Galatea*' is evidently of superior stamp, one upon whose notice he would not dream of thrusting an objectionable subject, and who would not consider Europa's contrition by any means excessive.

A maiden, she had allowed herself to be tempted into leaving her home without her father's knowledge or consent; she had irretrievably disgraced herself; nothing was left for her but either to die or to be taken into the harem of some barbaric prince as a slave and a concubine.

The heinousness of the offence may be illustrated by what Nausicaä says when she dreads the scandal which might arise if she were seen with Odysseus in her train, even when all her damsels kept her company; and what would have been thought of her if she had gone away from home alone for an indefinite time?

If however it be admitted that Horace most probably took the main idea from the poem of Moschus, yet the manner of execution is all his own.

And that consideration leads to a few more points in favour, I think, of my own view.

Horace, unlike Moschus, does not endow the bull with speech and so relieve the maiden's fears during the passage; on the contrary, he works the scene up to agony point, and then brings forward Venus (who has, no doubt, received the cue from Jove), accompanied by Cupid, to prevent the distressed damsel from doing herself a mischief, and to break to her the news of the high destiny awaiting her.

This appears to me to be the patent intention of the last two stanzas, in the first of which the re-appearance of the 'monster' is plainly foretold; it accounts for the '*perfidum ridens*' (the '*mocking smile*' which Venus wore from consciousness of her secret), gives an air of pleasant irony to the '*abstineto irarum calidaeque rixae*,' and leads up admirably to the climax, '*uxor invicti Jovis*.' Moreover, to my thinking, it tends to clear up the doubt about the proper interpretation of the words '*uxor invicti Jovis esse nescis*,' which—I would venture to suggest—is to be taken as a question or exclamation following naturally upon the hint that the bull is about to return *without* his 'horns' (as is implied by the ironical advice of the preceding lines), with *nescis* employed in a very common sense and construction (cf. *te nescit tangere*, *Od. III. 13, 9-10*, and the famous '*mentiri nescio*') so as to express (moral) incapability, after the fashion of the French '*ne savoir pas*.' 'Canst thou not be wife' (not the wife, who was Juno) 'of resistless Jove?' Then follows the obvious conclusion: [Of course thou canst] 'Away, then, with sobs,' &c.

Lastly, there seems to be no ground, either in the poem of Moschus or in the ode of Horace, for the supposition that the '*multum amati*' (line 47) signifies more than the fondness felt for any pet animal. All that these poets imply is that Jove, being in love with Europa, tempted her in a momentary fit of madness (*vieta furore* = *in a mad freak*), by his beauty, tameness, and affability, to mount upon his back, and then rushed into the sea with her, she merely regarding him as a very nice, tractable 'monster.'

This being so, I attach to the appearance of Cupid, 'with bow unbent,' a different meaning from that which is generally accepted. I take it to signify that Cupid is pretending to have 'done nothing,' and is thus seconding his mother in the 'merry jest' she enjoys until she reveals her secret. To my thinking a *bent* bow *with no arrow*



upon it would be the clearer sign that a love-shaft had lately been discharged, and an unbent bow would tell no tale at all. It is not until she is electrified by the words

*'Uxor invicti Jovis esse nescis?'* that Europa has any suspicion of the reason for Cupid's presenting himself before her.

ROBERT BLACK.

NOTES ON THE SCHOLIA OF THE *PLUTUS*.

ON I. 277 the Ravenna Codex has the following scholium:—

ἐν τῇ σορῷ: παρὰ τοῖς Ἀθηναίοις δέκα ἦσαν φυλαί. ἔθος οὖν ἀπὸ πασῶν τῶν φυλῶν δικαστὺς καθίζειν· εἴτα ἀπὸ μιᾶς ἐκάστης ἐλάμβανον ἄνδρας πέντε τοὺς ἐπιστημότερους·  
5 καὶ πάλιν ἐκ τῶν πέντε ἓνα τὸν κλήρῳ λαχόντα ἐποιοῦν δικάζειν. ἀντὶ οὖν τὸ εἰπεῖν ἐν τῷ δικαστηρίῳ κληρωθὲν τὸ γράμμα καὶ τὸ ψήφισμα ὃ ἐστὶν ὁ κληρὸς, δικάζειν σε καὶ δικαστὴν καθίστησιν, ὡς πρὸς γέροντα παρ' ὑπόνοιαν παίζει. Ἄλλως. ἐν ταῖς Ἀθήναις  
10 πολλὰ ἦν δικαστήρια. καὶ ἐν τισὶ μὲν ἐδίκαζον περὶ φονικῶν πραγμάτων, ἐν τισὶ δὲ περὶ δημοτικῶν· ἕκαστον δὲ τούτων εἶχεν ἓν τι τῶν στοιχείων ἰδικὸν ὄνομα. οἷον ἦν τι  
15 τῶν δικαστηρίων λεγόμενον ἄλφα, ὅμοιον ἄλλο β, ἄλλο δὲ γ, καὶ δ εἰς τὸ ε' δέκα γὰρ ἦν δικαστήρια τὰ πάντα ἐν Ἀθήναις, πρὸ θυρῶν δὲ ἐκάστου δικαστηρίου ἐγγράπτο πυρρῷ βάμματι τὸ στοιχεῖον οὗτιν τὸ δικαστήριον ὀνομάζετο. ὅσοι δὲ δικασταὶ ἦσαν ἐν  
20 Ἀθήναις, ἕκαστος καθ' ἕκαστον δικαστήριον εἶχε δέλτον, παρ' ὑπόνοιαν δὲ λέγει σκώπτων τὸν γέροντα.

There are perhaps in those scholia of the *Plutus* which I have yet studied, many more interesting corrections than are possible here, but this I have selected as suggesting very plainly the kind of corruption against which one must always guard. The line of the play from which the lemma comes is written in R thus:—

ἐν τῇ σορῷ νυνὶ λαχόν τὸ γράμμα σοῦ δικάζει.

The one long scholium on the first three words will furnish notes for the whole line as well as for the variant *δικάζειν*. (After each note I give the line of the scholium from which it comes.) Thus:—

(a) [ἐν τῇ σορῷ:] ἀντὶ τοῦ ἐν τῷ δικαστηρίῳ (6, 7), *in your coffin*, instead of *in the court-house*.

(b) [ἐν τῇ σορῷ:] παρ' ὑπόνοιαν λέγει σκώπτων τὸν γέροντα (22, 23), he speaks by implication with a jest at the old man's cost.

(c) [λαχόν:] κληρωθὲν (7).

(d) τὸ γράμμα: τὸ ψήφισμα (7, 8), 'the number'; a late use of *ψήφισμα* = a numerical figure.

(e) [ἐν τῇ σορῷ νυνὶ κ.τ.λ. :] οὐ ἐστὶν ὁ κληρὸς δικάζειν σε· ὡς πρὸς γέροντα παρ' ὑπόνοιαν παίζει (8, 9), 'where it is your lot to sit in state,' as addressing an old man he makes fun by implication.

(f) [δικάζει:] δικαστὴν καθίστησιν (9, 'appoints you to the jury'.

(g) [τὸ γράμμα:] ἐν ταῖς Ἀθήναις πολλὰ ἦν δικαστήρια. καὶ ἐν τισὶ μὲν ἐδίκαζον περὶ φονικῶν πραγμάτων, ἐν τισὶ δὲ περὶ δημοτικῶν· ἕκαστον δὲ τούτων εἶχεν ἓν τι τῶν στοιχείων εἰδικὸν ὄνομα. οἷον ἦν τι τῶν δικαστηρίων λεγόμενον α, ὅμοιός ἄλλο β, ἄλλο δὲ γ καὶ ἐξῆς (10-16). In Athens there were many courts, and in some they decided criminal suits, and in some civil. Each of these courts had one of the letters of the alphabet as a name to distinguish it by; for example, there was a court called *alpha*, likewise another *beta*, a third *gamma*, and so on. The reading *καὶ ἐξῆς* comes from another codex which, however, goes on to nullify it by the interpolation τὸ δ καὶ τὸ ε καὶ ἔως τοῦ κ. δέκα γὰρ ἦν δικαστήρια τὰ πάντα ἐν Ἀθήναις.

(h) [τὸ γράμμα:] πρὸ θυρῶν ἐκάστου δικαστηρίου ἐγγράπτο πυρρῷ βάμματι τὸ στοιχεῖον ᾧτιν τὸ δικαστήριον ὀνομάζετο. ὅσοι δὲ δικασταὶ ἦσαν ἐν Ἀθήναις ἕκαστος καθ' ἕκαστον δικαστήριον εἶχε δέλτον (17-22). Before the doors of each court was written in red colour the letter of the alphabet by which the court was named, and all the dicasts in Athens had each a ticket which varied with the court to which he was assigned. It is possible that from ὅσοι is a separate scholium on τὸ γράμμα, in which case the δέ must be omitted.

There remain ll. 1-6 still to account for. The first half is really a scholium on ll. 1166, 67—

οὐκ ἐτὸς ἅπαντες οἱ δικάζοντες θαμὰ σπεύδουσιν ἐν πολλοῖς γεγραπταῖς γράμμασιν,

which has got misplaced just as in the scholia on l. 972—

ἀλλ' οὐ λαχούσ' ἔπινες ἐν τῷ γράμματι ;

we get a note which properly belongs to this passage—

[ἐν τῇ σοφῇ:] ἐπειδὴ καὶ γέροντές εἰσιν οἱ δικάζοντες.

The lines still left form a piece of erroneous learning which at present I cannot account for, but I have no doubt that the source of the interpolation will become clear in time.

W. GUNION RUTHERFORD.

## TWO NOTES ON SYRACUSE.

### I. ACHRADINA.

It is generally assumed that the name *Achradina* denotes the high ground<sup>1</sup> north of Ortygia, which forms the eastern end of Epipolae. Some writers, however, understand the word to mean not only this high ground but also the lower ground between it and Ortygia, (e.g. *Lupus Stadt Syrakus*, p. 27), and this was the view of Cluver and D'Orville. I am not quite sure that the facts bear out either assumption.

The name, as is well known, does not occur in Thucydides. Unless I am mistaken, it is absent also from the accounts of the Athenian siege given by Diodorus and Plutarch. It probably came into use after 400 B.C., and Diodorus commits a small anachronism when he employs it in his earlier history (xi. 67, 72, &c.). On the other hand, the name was certainly in use in Cicero's time—indeed the orator is the first writer to mention it—and it is natural to suppose that it was known some time before the prosecution of Verres.

The chief writers who use the name are Diodorus, Livy, and Cicero. In no passage is its meaning accurately defined, but in no passage is it described as an elevation of any sort. The most striking point about the allusions to it in Diodorus is the close connexion implied between it and Ortygia: 'Ἀχραδίνη τε καὶ Νῆσος is almost a standing phrase (e.g. xi. 72, 73, 76). When in 467 Thrasylbulus, brother and successor of Hieron and Gelon, marched out of Ortygia to attack the rebellious Syracusans, he led his troops, says Diodorus, out through Achradina and fought ἐν τοῖς προαστείοις. Indeed the only passage, so far as I know, which seems to imply any interval between Ortygia and Achradina is that (xi. 72) which speaks of 'both places having their own walls' (ἀμφοτέρων τῶν τόπων τούτων ἔχόντων ἴδιον τεῖχος καλῶς κατασκευασμένον). These words have

<sup>1</sup> It rises some 220 feet above sea-level.

led some scholars to imagine that Achradina included only the high ground at the east end of Epipolae. It is, perhaps, more probable that the ἴδια τεῖχη were built on account of the 'isthmus' which joined Ortygia to the mainland. The exact character of this isthmus is a vexed question, but there seems to have been, at most times, some sort of water-passage or canal connecting the Great and the Little Harbours, and it may be assumed that the two parts of the town, separated by either water or a narrow isthmus, would have independent fortifications. I conclude, then, that Diodorus meant by Achradina the flat ground outside of Ortygia and s. of Epipolae. It is possible, as Dr. Lupus thinks, that he meant also the higher ground to the north, but there is no proof of this. In thus arguing, I do not wish to imply that the account given by Diodorus of (say) the troubles in 467 is particularly trustworthy. Diodorus was, however, a Sicilian. Probably he knew Syracuse, and, if we can ascertain what he meant by the word, we shall know what it meant to his contemporaries.

In Livy we find the same connexion supposed between Ortygia and Achradina. The collocation *Achradina atque Insula* is fairly common (xxv. 24, 10, 29, 10, &c.), and the account of the capture of Syracuse by Marcellus in 212 seems to imply that Achradina was on the low ground, that it was, as Mommsen calls it (Engl. Tr. ii. 148) 'the city proper on the shore.' Thus, on the night of the final betrayal, Marcellus (xxv. 30, 7) *navem onerariam cum armatis remulco quadriremis ad Achradinam trahi iussit, exponique milites regione portae quae prope fontem Arethusae est*. Livy and his authorities were not good geographers, but this sentence is unintelligible if Achradina was upon the east end of Epipolae.

Cicero only mentions Achradina twice—once in a passage of very doubtful reading. In the Verrines (iv. 119), he describes it as

the quarter containing the finest buildings, *forum maximum, pulcherrimae porticus, ornatissimum prytanium, amplissima curia templumque egregium Iovis Olympii ceteraque urbis partes, quae una via lata perpetua multisque transversis divisae, privatis aedificiis continentur*. Holm (*Topografia* p. 182 = Lupus p. 100) has shown that the *forum* was near the Island, and it is generally agreed that the happy hunting-ground of future excavators lies between Ortygia and the plateau, and not on the plateau. The 'long street,' which Cicero mentions, ran perhaps from east to west below Epipolae. Dr. Lupus (p. 30) not unnaturally supposes it to have been on the Achradina of the received account, on Epipolae. But he confesses that there survives no trace of it or of the public buildings mentioned by Cicero. When and to what extent this point was inhabited is very uncertain. There is no doubt that the population of Syracuse never filled up anything like the whole space enclosed by the walls of Dionysius.

Achradina, then, seems to have been the lower ground between Ortygia and Epipolae. Such a view sounds revolutionary. In reality it requires only the alteration of one name in our maps and histories. It does not affect our accounts of the Athenian siege, and it need not greatly change our ideas of the Roman siege. Before I leave the point, I should like to meet two general objections which may be raised. First, it will be said that the east end of Epipolae was a strategic position which must have been occupied early, and that in fact it was occupied. That traces of fortification remain in the so-called 'Wall of Gelon' seems undoubted, but the 900 yards of escarpment which have received this name cannot be fixed to any date, and, even if they were Gelon's work, they would not prove that the hill was known as Achradina. The argument that the position is too good to have been overlooked is a most dangerous one. It is the argument which has led many archaeologists for instance to assign a Roman origin to the camps on the Sussex south-downs. Ancient warfare was very unlike modern, and the Greek, like the Roman, did not necessarily occupy the waterless top of the nearest hill. Defence was stronger than attack in those days, and more trust was placed in walls than in hills. Given a good rampart and 200 yards of level ground outside it, the enemy might dance to his heart's content on the neighbouring hill-tops. Secondly it may be argued that my view does not allow space enough for historical events. This, again, is a dan-

gerous argument. Nothing surprises one so much, on visiting the field of even so recent a battle as Waterloo, as the excessive smallness of the ground. We may think what we like of figures given by Diodorus or Livy, and of Beloch's estimate that Syracuse in 415 included 100,000 inhabitants. But we shall be on the safer side, if we contract our ideas of size.

## II. Ἡ ἔξω πόλις (Thuc. vi. 3 and 75).

During the winter of 415-414, the Syracusans built an outer wall, which ran, apparently, right across Epipolae from north to south and down to the Great Harbour. With the accepted view as to this wall—which I have represented on my *Raised Model of Syracuse*—I have no quarrel, but I have never understood the reason which Thucydides gives for the operation. It was done, he says (vi. 75) ὅπως μὴ δι' ἐλάσσονος εἰσπορεύουσιν ὥστε, ἣν ἄρα σφάλωνται, if, that is, they were defeated in the field. It has been suggested to me that the Syracusans wished to have the blockading lines as far from their city as possible. Perhaps they did, but Thucydides does not say it, and a blockading line is equally effective at one or at two miles' distance, if only it be complete. The common explanation seems to me equally unsatisfactory. The new wall was built (it is said) so that the Athenians might have a longer line to blockade. This view agrees with Thucydides, but not with the maps drawn to illustrate it. The exact extent of the Syracusan fortifications previous to 415 is a moot point, but it is agreed that Ortygia and the eastern end of Epipolae were fortified, separately or together. Now the lines of a force blockading these sites would run north and south from the sea across Epipolae to the Great Harbour for a length of about three miles. But the lines actually commenced by Nicias would, if completed, have been but a trifle longer. It is incredible that the defenders built a new and extensive wall simply in order to give Nicias another three or four hundred yards to cover. Nor is the difficulty removed by the view of Göller (*Syracusae*, 1818) and an old *Philip's Atlas* (Liverpool, 1855), that the new wall formed a sort of wedge up the middle of Epipolae.

I think, then, that the received views do not explain how Syracuse would have been δι' ἐλάσσονος εἰσπορεύουσιν had not the new wall been built in 415-414. On the other hand, there seems no reason to doubt the generally accepted view as to the extent and direction of this new wall. The diffi-

culty may perhaps be solved by changing our traditional conceptions of the fortifications existing previous to 415. On this point we have little information. Remains there are none, except the 'Wall of Gelon' to which (as I said above) no date can be assigned. Plutarch and Diodorus tell us practically nothing, and one is left to Thucydides. Here we have definite mention of an ἐντὸς πόλις (Ortygia) and an ἔξω πόλις which is προστεχθεῖσα, and would therefore naturally be on the low ground between Ortygia and Epipolae. And, if we take this account in its simple sense, difficulties vanish. Previous to 415, the fortified Syracuse lay to the s. of Epipolae. The southern slope of this plateau is gentle at the eastern end, and cannot have interfered with the wall of the outer city, still less have commanded it. When Nicias approached, the Syracusans naturally desired to increase the area of blockade. Perhaps, too, they had some dim feeling—Dionysius saw it plainly enough ten years later—that Syracuse could be attacked from Epipolae and not from the Anapus valley. So they not

only garrisoned Epipolae (vi. 96), but also built a wall—for all that we can prove, 'Gelon's Wall' may be a trace of it—running up across Epipolae due north, and reaching the sea somewhere near the creek of S. Bonagia and the later suburb Tycha. It is needless to point out that this made the blockade lines much longer than before.

If this is so, the ἔξω πόλις of Thucydides is the later Ἀχραδίνη, and both lie between Epipolae and the Great Harbour. But I have tried to argue the case for each independently, because, first, it is necessary to understand that the Athenian siege and the site of Achradina are in no way connected, and, secondly, the independent conclusions do strengthen each other. Each requires us to take an identical view of the condition of Syracuse in earlier times. Syracuse still remains μεγαλοπόλις, but less astonishingly so than has usually been represented, and this is in itself some confirmation of my view.

F. HAVERFIELD.

#### DR. MOMMSEN ON THE RECRUITING SYSTEM FOR LEGIONARIES AND AUXILIARIES UNDER THE EMPIRE IN *HERMES* XIX.

SEVERAL recently found military inscriptions, as well as the thorough tabulation of those previously known (in *Ephem. Epigr.* vol. v.), have done much to clear up the subject of the imperial method of recruiting both for the legions and the auxiliaries. Hitherto it has been believed that in the early empire the legionaries were taken from Roman citizens only, and therefore came with a few exceptions of individual 'citizens' belonging to towns of Latin right, from those completely enfranchised communities which were chiefly to be found in the West. The inscriptions relating to the armies of Germany and Africa, the provinces about which we are best informed, contained nothing inconsistent with this view. Thus of the legions I. Germanica, IV. Macedonica and XIV. Gemina, during their stay in Germany in the first century, all the soldiers whose origin can be traced came from Italy and the West; so too, those of the IIIrd Augusta during its stay at Theveste. Among the Danube legions the rule is not so absolute. While of the three Pannonian legions (XV. Apollinaris, VIII. Augusta and IX. His-

pana), two only out of twenty-six come from the East, of the Dalmatian legions ten out of twenty-six do so, and the inscriptions from Troesmis in Lower Moesia show a similar distribution. About the oriental legions an inscription recently discovered at Coptos (*Ephem. Epigr.* v. p. 5), and dating from Augustus or Tiberius, has for the first time given us considerable information. Out of thirty-six cases from the two Egyptian legions (XXII. Deiotariana, and III. Cyrenaica), fourteen are from Galatia, nine from Egypt itself, and nine from Pontus, Syria, and Bithynia, or other parts of Asia Minor. In other words an overwhelming majority come from the East, from regions where the towns of Roman right were extremely few. This is confirmed by Tacitus, *Ann.* xiii. 7 and 35, where for Corbulo's army, 'habiti per Galatiam Cappadociamque dilectus.' While therefore in the first century the German and African and Pannonian legions were recruited from Italy and the West, the Oriental legions were raised in the Eastern parts; the Dalmatian and Moesian legions occupying, as in situation, so in recruiting an intermediate



place, a fact which is also confirmed by Tacitus, *Ann.* xvi. 13, 'dilectus per Galliam Narbonensem, Africamque et Asiam habiti suppledis Illyricis legionibus.'

Clearly, therefore, the legionaries were not all necessarily taken from those already possessed of the franchise. Indeed the republican generals had gradually gained the right of recruiting non-citizens for the legions, on whom, however, on enlistment the *civitas* was conferred. In the Civil Wars whole legions were raised in this way (*vernaculae legiones*), and Augustus though he confined the general use of this practice to the East, still continued it in the West also in the case of individual recruits, and after the defeat of Varus even raised a whole legion, the XX1st Rapax, in this way (Tacitus, *Ann.* i. 31). Practically, therefore, he was only limited in his recruiting by the two qualifications of municipal origin and free birth, though even these were often eluded. There was thus a radical difference between the legions of the East and the West. We know of only one instance of a legion (the XVth Apollinaris) permanently transferred from the West to the East, and no instance the other way, though in the Eastern crises, it was common to reinforce the untrustworthy Oriental legions from the Western armies.

Under Vespasian an important change took place, in consequence of the military insubordination shown in the war with Civilis. The Italians, whose pride of birth made them less amenable to discipline, were henceforth practically excluded from legionary service. Thus out of twenty cases from the 1st Adiutrix raised by Galba, and 1st Minervia by Domitian only one is an Italian. One result was to throw a greater burden on the rest of the West, and it was found necessary to supply the African legion from the East. Thus of seventy-eight soldiers of the IIIrd Aug. enlisted by Trajan, thirty-two come from Syria, and twenty-two from Bithynia. Hitherto the recruiting had taken place both in senatorial and imperial provinces, in the former through the proconsul, in the latter through an imperial officer of equestrian rank. But under Hadrian, to decrease expense and to secure greater rapidity, a system of local recruiting was introduced, and in consequence the senatorial provinces, which contained no legions, were altogether omitted. In the inscriptions of the IIIrd Augusta from Lambaesis, the recruiting is shown to have been from Africa and Numidia almost exclusively, while an Egyptian inscription (*Eph. Epig.* v. p. 260) shows that from the IInd Trajana, twenty-eight out of thirty-

NO. XXII. VOL. III.

seven cases are from Egypt itself. Germany, however, and Gaul, being used largely for the auxiliary levy could not supply all the recruits for the German legions, in which accordingly, we find still a larger number of soldiers from elsewhere. Another important result of the local conscription was the position given to the Illyrian provinces, and especially to Pannonia. The primacy of the Danube legions in the second and third centuries became a primacy of the Illyrian soldiers, a result reflected in the series of Illyrian emperors, which was directly brought about by the exclusion of senators from posts in the army by Gallienus. It was not an unnatural consequence of local recruiting that the legions from this time were rarely moved from their provinces. With the exception of the three legions raised by Severus, and his removal of the Vth Macedonica from Moesia to Dacia, the list in the Vatican Inscription *C. I. L.* vi. 3492, dating between 120 and 170 A.D., and that of Dio Cassius (53, 24) under Alexander Severus agree in every point. A further change with important results was the gradual extension of the system of *vicarii*, dating perhaps from Trajan's reign (*Plin. Ep. ad Traj.* 30). When this was brought into connection with the system of *colonatus*, and the great landowners sent their serfs into the legions, their character was greatly changed, a fact which has to be remembered in the wars against the Goths and Huns.

The auxiliary forces, *cohortes* and *alae*, were in a peculiar sense the emperor's own troops, and in military importance, though not in dignity, hardly stood behind the legions. That they were recruited solely from the imperial provinces is proved negatively by the fact that with one or two exceptions, which upon examination prove the rule, no names of districts or tribes appear belonging to senatorial provinces. This general induction is verified by the particular inscriptions in which the origin of auxiliary soldiers is stated. While therefore the senatorial provinces till Hadrian provided legionaries only, the others provided auxiliaries as well, though a system of compensation can be discerned. Thus Raetia raised at least eight cohorts, Noricum only one cohort and one *ala*, but while twenty-two legionaries from Noricum are known, only one appears from Raetia. So Galatia was almost passed over by the auxiliary levy, but provided many men for the Egyptian and Syrian legions. The auxiliaries again necessarily entered the service as non-citizens, as the legionaries did as citizens, but not only were they rewarded

with the *civitas* after twenty-five years' service (see *Diplomata* in *C. I. L.* iii.), but sometimes during actual service, which explains the otherwise perplexing fact that in inscriptions auxiliary soldiers are sometimes found assigned to one of the tribes. Where they are stated, as is sometimes the case, to belong to a colony, they were either assigned to this after their enfranchisement, or, as Mommsen thinks, the colony is to be regarded as only a Latin colony. It not unfrequently happened that the *civitas* was granted to a whole cohort as a special reward, in which case the words '*civium Romanorum*' were added to its official description (*C. I. L.* III. 1577), but while the title apparently remained, the position of recruits was not affected by it.

Under Augustus in all probability, and during the Julio-Claudian reigns, the auxiliaries were not only recruited from the districts whose names they bear, but were for the most part posted in or near their own provinces. Definite proofs of this are few, as there are no *diplomata* of so early a date, and accounts, like those of Tacitus for the Batavian and Jewish wars, are rare. There was probably no hard and fast rule on the subject, and in many cases it may have been a matter of indifference. But economical and sanitary grounds would favour their employment near their homes, while the inconvenience of posting troops in a country with strange language and habits would be greater for auxiliaries than for the legions with their large camps and greater organisation. On the other hand there were reasons which from the first must have worked in an opposite direction. Small provinces like Raetia or Thrace would certainly not need all their auxiliaries, while large provinces like Germany could hardly supply all they

required. Again legions, when moved to a fresh province, probably took their auxiliaries with them. Thus Batavian cohorts accompanied the XIVth legion to Britain (*Tac. Hist.* iv. 12), and cohorts of Lusitani (*Hist.* i. 70), and Vascones (iv. 33) accompanied the IVth Macedonica from Spain to Germany. So too, cohorts with peculiar arms or equipments were naturally wanted in different parts; as e.g. Syrians and Dalmatians. On the whole Augustus seems to have posted the auxiliaries in their own homes, unless exceptional circumstances prevented it. Thus German auxiliaries certainly served in Germany till 69, but a military diploma of 60 shows that hardly any native auxiliaries served in Pannonia, a difference explained by the Pannonian revolt of 6 A.D. No doubt from the various causes mentioned, the exceptions to the original plan increased as time went on, but Vespasian changed the principle of their employment. Moved, no doubt, by the Batavian rising, he carried out in other provinces the method of Augustus in Pannonia, and from his time the auxiliaries were to a great extent denationalised, i.e. employed away from home, and also recruited to a great extent locally. A further change, beginning with Trajan, was the formation of what were called *numeri* in inscriptions, and *nationes* in Hyginus, bodies of barbarians equipped with their own arms, and forming strictly national corps, such as the Mauri of Lusius Quietus, Daci, Palmyreni, Sarmatae, &c. These, however, differed from the auxiliaries in not necessarily coming from districts possessed of the right of Latini or peregrini, and were in fact an anticipation of the later employment of Goths and Franks.

E. G. HARDY.

#### THE *TIMAEUS* OF PLATO.

*The Timaeus of Plato.* Edited, with Introduction and Notes, by R. D. ARCHER-HIND, M.A. Macmillan. 16s.

To edit the *Timaeus* is a difficult task. The Greek is hard, the text not always certain, the matter requires to elucidate it considerable learning, some knowledge of science and metaphysics, a sound acquaintance with the records of Greek philosophy up to Aristotle and farther; above all, in a work where the mythical element has opened a wide door to extravagance, a sober judgment combined

with training in the criticism of ancient philosophical texts.

Our editor has undertaken all departments. His interest is in the philosophy to which his Introduction is devoted, but the larger part of the notes is taken up by the other matters.

Excellent work has been done in the *Timaeus*: in the text by Stallbaum and C. F. Hermann, on the matter by Böckh, Martin, Zeller, and others nearer home.

The editor in his Introduction implies the place of his own work in some judgments

upon his predecessors. 'Lindau's commentary,' he says, 'does not afford much real help in grappling with the main difficulties of the dialogue.' Praising Stallbaum only for industry, he says 'it would be unfair to disparage the learning which the notes display: none the less it cannot be denied that in dealing with the dialogue the editor seems hardly to have realised the nature of the task he has undertaken.' Martin is praised for modesty and 'unfailing candour.' His edition is declared to be 'far and away' the best. But 'as an exposition of the philosophical import of the dialogue, I,' says the editor, 'should not be disposed to rate it so very highly; but so far as it deals with the physical and other scientific questions discussed and with the numerous difficulties of detail it is invaluable. . . . The debt owed to Martin by any subsequent editor must needs be great.'

The editor's relation to his predecessors will be considered first, then the 'scholarship' of the edition, thirdly the scientific notes, and lastly the philosophical commentary.

Some things are taken with acknowledgement from Stallbaum, but a large use is made of his notes without any acknowledgement whatever. Note after note seems a reproduction or a variation of Stallbaum, especially in the earlier part of the book, afterwards the notes come more and more to be related in a similar way to Martin. Any one may verify this for himself. Some of the notes are little more than a translation. Here it need only be pointed out that the relation exists where it is not obvious at first sight. We noticed a place where the silent reproduction of a point of Stallbaum's was followed by some apparently original matter, comprising quotations from Aristotle, but found it all given in a modern book quoted by Stallbaum, and in the parts to which his references direct. Sometimes portions of a note of Stallbaum's are unskillfully put together and require the complete original to explain them. In return Stallbaum is attacked often with disrespect, often unfairly, and often when he is right. It is not necessary to dwell on a subject so unprofitable, farther than to give one passage out of many in illustration of Stallbaum's great advantage in scholarship, and one to illustrate the editor's want of fairness to him.

37A. λέγει (ἡ ψυχὴ)...ὅτω τ' ἂν τι ταῦτόν ᾗ καὶ ὅτον ἂν ἕτερον, πρὸς ὃ τί τε μάλιστα καὶ ὅπη καὶ ὅπως καὶ ὅποτε ἐνυμβαίνει κατὰ τὰ γιγνόμενά τε πρὸς ἕκαστον ἕκαστα εἶναι καὶ πάσχειν καὶ

πρὸς τὰ κατὰ ταῦτα ἔχοντα αἰεί. The editor writes, 'Stallbaum, affirming that no one has hitherto understood this passage, takes the antecedent of ὅτω as the subject of ἐνυμβαίνει: "she declares of that wherewith anything is the same and wherefrom it is different, in relation to what &c." It may well be doubted whether he has thus improved upon his predecessors.' The innuendo is unfortunate, not so much because Stallbaum is right and the editor has made a grave mistake, as that it draws attention to a conspicuous trait of the editor's own manner. Stallbaum's claim comes nowhere near the self-complacency of the note on 41A, where the editor, after changing the punctuation of the text, says, 'It is impossible not to admire the serenity with which all the editors set a full stop after ἐθέλοντος, and then make a fresh start . . . ; as though γίγνεται stood in the place of γιγνόμενα &c.'; where too the editor has not the excuse of being right, for he has seriously misrepresented the facts. In the present passage Stallbaum's explanation is grammatical and scholarly; the editor's is not even grammatical. Stallbaum, as said above, rightly makes ὅτω τ' ἂν τι ταῦτόν ᾗ κ.τ.λ. subject of εἶναι: the editor makes the clause (ὅστις ἂν with subj.) indirect interrogative, coordinate with πρὸς ὃ τί τε κ.τ.λ. (i.e. 'he tells what a thing is identical with or different from'), which is merely impossible. Stallbaum makes ἕκαστα (= 'identical and different') predicate, with εἶναι as copula. The editor makes ἕκαστα subject of εἶναι, and is actually committed to making εἶναι πρὸς ἕκαστον = 'to act upon each thing,' where εἶναι is not helped out by any predicate. Further ὅπη καὶ ὅπως, 'in what way and manner' (Stallb. 'auf welche Art und Weise'), is rendered 'in what place or manner.' The general objection made to Stallbaum's whole view is a curious bit of logic, and would be equally fatal to the editor's own. All these mistakes come from a determination to see (with Lindau) an anticipation of Aristotle's ten categories. Add to this that the editor, after so speaking of Stallbaum's claims to improvement, reproduces another part of the same note bodily, in silence; and in the next note where Stallbaum makes a similar claim, adopts his view in the translation and reproduces part of his note, in silence.

The instance promised of unfairness is the following—66A, τῶν δὲ αὐτῶν...εἰς...τὰς στενὰς φλέβας ἐνδονομένων, καὶ τοῖς ἐνοῦσιν αὐτοῖσι μέρεσι γεώδεσι καὶ ὅσα ἀέρος ἐνυμετρίαν ἔχοντα κ.τ.λ. The editor says, 'I have little doubt that ἐχόντων should be read for ἔχοντα. Stall-

baum's proposed alterations are the result of his not understanding the construction: *ὅσα ἀέρος* is parallel to *τοῖς γεώδεσι* and equivalent to *τοῖς ὅσα ἀέρος ἐνέσθιν.* It may seem incredible, but it is true, that the emendation is Stallbaum's, and the construction he is supposed not to understand is the very one he gives. 'Itaque legendum fortasse videbitur ἐχόντων &c.' He takes *ὅσα ἀέρος*, exactly as the editor does, as parallel to *γεώδεσι*, translating the one 'partibus aeris,' and the other 'partibus terrenis.'

In explanation of this extraordinary circumstance we notice a tendency in the editor to forget benefits and only remember what he thinks mistaken in those on whose notes he is dependent. We hardly doubt that he first learned from Stallbaum the view he here maintains, but only remembered, when he came to write himself, his disagreement (probably) with some other views of Stallbaum's later on in the same lengthy note. To these views the expression 'proposed alterations' (which would however be a misrepresentation) may refer. In common fairness he should have looked at the note again before publishing the criticism. That he should not do so is accounted for by a perversity like that of which he accuses Grote. Grote, he says, insists on something 'in his eagerness to convict Plato of an irrationality.' The eagerness to convict of error Stallbaum (and others, e.g. Aristotle, as we shall see) is nearly a mania with the editor. The instance we have given is not unique; there is an equally astonishing one in the editor's relation to Martin, for which however we have no space. Most of the instances are however not such direct denial, but rather misrepresentation.

From Martin come the bulk of the more scientific notes and many matters of general interpretation; some scientific notes are from Boeckh and some from Stallbaum. Indeed, excepting the philosophy, the commentary in general is made up from those of Martin and Stallbaum. The obligation is not fairly acknowledged, and the material has not been improved. Any one could do better who would make an intelligent redaction of the notes of these two editors (with additions from Boeckh), stating their views clearly with the grounds for them.

In the matter of quotations there is a large unacknowledged debt to the stores accumulated by Martin. In this way have been constructed a number of learned-looking notes, embodying extracts from various works of Aristotle, Theophrastus, Galen, 'Hippocrates,' and others. The

Engelmann edition, Zeller, and Liddell and Scott seem also to have been laid under contribution.

Not unfrequently the editor shows scanty knowledge of the book quoted beyond what is in his authorities: sometimes by repeating their errors; sometimes by omissions of a most tell-tale character; sometimes by inferences or applications which the context of the quotation proves impossible; sometimes by an account of a theory, showing unacquaintance with the principal passages relating to it.

Sometimes he is betrayed by an apparently unimportant remark. For instance in the note on (70 c), the editor tells us a certain doctrine is 'affirmed by the author of the *De Ossium Natura*, a work of uncertain date, vol. I. p. 515, Kühn.' The editor had possibly read a remark in a part of Littré which Martin cites, that certain 'Hippocratic' treatises, including a fragment (not the whole) of the *De Oss. Nat.* were later than Aristotle, and thought it safe to speak of the authorship and date of the 'work' as he does. Now the *De Oss. Nat.* cannot be said to be a 'work,' or to have an author or a date. It is established that it consists of five extracts from different books, some at least by different authors, on the subject of the veins (not the bones) collected by some unknown hand. Two of them are quoted by Aristotle himself who gives their authors.

It is not merely with out-of-the-way books, relating to the *Timaeus*, that such imperfect knowledge is shown, but also with works of Aristotle and Theophrastus which lie in the beaten track, and must be known in any case by one who professes to edit the *Timaeus*.

In one place, Plato's theory of respiration, the editor gives the reader the impression that he has done a piece of original and meritorious research, by using the Greek of a commentary (Galen's) only known in 'a defective Latin translation' when Martin wrote. All that he gets out of the Greek is equally clear in the Latin which is not here defective. All that he rightly gets out of it, and even the illustrative woodcut (a little altered) is already given in the note and translation of the edition used (Daremberg's), to which no acknowledgment is made. We can hardly think the editor has read the Latin: his mistake about it may come from a remark of Daremberg's.

Next will be considered the 'scholarship' of the edition; and first the construction of the text.



As is well known, a new collation of the MS., Paris. A, is much wanted. In default of this, a register of the recorded variants of the MSS. might be required in an edition of such pretensions. The editor has thought otherwise, and we shall only criticise him within his own limits. He proposes to follow Paris. A mainly, and to record only the differences of his text from that MS. and from the editions of Stallbaum, the Zurich editor, and of C. F. Hermann, to whose text he says he has 'rather closely adhered.' There are two main collations of Paris. A, Bekker's and Bast's, which disagree. The minimum which could give the apparatus criticus a scientific value would be a record of these two collations. But if, disregarding scientific value, only one collation were followed, it should be Bast's which appears at least the more accurate. In any case, whatever is given should be given correctly. The editor fulfils none of these conditions, not even the most elementary. He has not collated the Paris. MS.; he does not seem even to have seen Bast's collation, though it is so accessible: he follows Bekker and does not give him correctly; and he does not even give correctly the promised variations of other editions. He does not seem to be aware that there is an edition of the text by Stallbaum later than the one he has used. He has not even studied properly the short *adnotatio critica* which precedes the text of the editor (C. F. Hermann) whom he follows, and thus make some amusing mistakes, especially where he measures himself against Hermann.

In the *apparatus criticus* to the first ten pages of the text, we found, omitting some minor points, thirty mistakes; and felt absolved from further consideration of it. The editor's own emendations generally deserve such a judgment as he pronounces on an emendation of Stallbaum's, 'Stallbaum not understanding this sentence desires to corrupt it.' Little, if any, first-hand use has been made of the ancient testimonia: some of them do not seem to have been used at all. No detail of unscholarly procedure seems wanting.

Next may be considered the editor's 'linguistic exegesis.' The existence of several translations, Latin, German, French, and English, and of editions with good philological notes, ought to limit somewhat the possibility of mistakes: but the editor contrives to make a quantity of them.

Among the mistakes of interpretation are found many which turn on grammatical

points. Sometimes again the editor naïvely defends a well-known usage and defends it inaccurately: or he 'restores' Plato's words from unacquaintance with an idiom: or he objects to a reading, a grammatical peculiarity, which is just in its favour: or in default of understanding a construction he invents a rule of syntax *à priori*:—all this too with confident dogmatism and attacks on scholars of mark. Plato's idioms give him much trouble, more especially hyperbaton about which he is continually wrong. The translation which 'has been given with a view to relieving the notes,' performs this office not unfrequently by contradicting them.

A few specimens only of the mistakes can be given. In 41 c *ὑπαρξάμενος*, which means 'having made beginning,' is translated 'having provided it'—(Is the editor thinking of *ὑπάρχειν* in sense of 'to be provided'?) with the quaint note, 'this transitive use of the verb is not quoted in Liddell and Scott.' The Lexicon will doubtless remain firm: it happens that it quotes the passage with right interpretation. In 22 d the note shows that *ρύνόμενος*, 'delivering' is taken for something like 'flowing' or 'overflowing': a mistake evidently from the German translation used by the editor. In 38 b is a wonderful piece of philosophising, too long to quote, based on a mistake in a tense—the imperfect in idiomatic combination with the aorist. In 53 b ... *παρὰ πάντα ἡμῖν ὡς αὐτὸ τοῦτο λεγόμενον ὑπαρξέτω* is translated 'must above all things be the foundation whereon our account is for ever based'; the meaning is simply, 'this principle must be assumed throughout (*παρὰ*) our whole investigation as always understood.' We have no space to do justice to the mistakes in hyperbaton and other constructions which we have alluded to: but, for an example, may ask the reader to study the translation of 35 a and the note there beginning, 'First a word concerning the Greek,' which is also an illustration of the editor's faculty of making several serious mistakes at once. First he misses the construction, which is a hyperbaton, though made quite clear by a parallel statement in the very next clause. Next a rule is found to explain it, named by the inventor 'loose anticipative apposition,' by help of which some odd Greek sentences might be constructed. Then he makes an inaccurate criticism of Stallbaum seemingly copied from Martin. The culmination is the rendering of *τῆς... γιγνομένης μεριστῆς* (sc. *οὐσίας*) by 'substance which becomes divided': it should be 'divisible substance which belongs to the

world of Becoming'—'substance divisible and phenomenal.'

We will give one instance of the *naïveté* spoken of. In 40 c the editor thinks he is breaking ground in defending the construction of a double indirect interrogative, which he supposes uncommon, and in applying it to the passage. The idiom, recognised in Grammars, is very common in certain combinations. The instance he gives of it is not one at all. It is applied to this very passage in Jowett's translation with which, he tells us, he is acquainted; and in the German translation which he has quoted only three lines above, though an emendation is preferred in the notes to it.

The scientific notes, which we now come to, are pretentious and unsound. As already indicated, they are made almost entirely out of the work of Stallbaum, Martin and Boeckh, and their sole value lies in what is reproduced. The reproduction is not accurate, nor does the editor always understand the materials he is using. Here and there the editor has been unwise enough to interpose confident criticisms of the sources of his inspiration. We can only give a rapid review.

The first is the passage on the proportion of the elements in 31. The editor says he follows Martin with some modifications as against Boeckh. He gives important mathematical points which the reader would certainly suppose his own, but they are from one of Boeckh's essays. He attempts a criticism in one matter both of Martin and Boeckh as having made 'a difficulty which is really no difficulty at all,' and in so doing makes a serious mistake in Greek mathematics, which he might have avoided if he had understood more of the part of Boeckh he read; or if he had read the propositions in Euclid, book vii., which any one who presumes to have an opinion on the passage must read; or even if he had seen the evidence in the passage of Plato before him. And as to Boeckh's view of the whole passage, the editor is hardly entitled to speak as he does of its ability ('Boeckh, who has written two able essays on the subject'): for either he has not read them through, or, we cannot but think, he did not understand them. The essential points of them do not appear in the editor's note at all; and what he professes to quote as Boeckh's 'explanation' is an extract entirely unintelligible by itself.

In the note on the musical scales the handling of the material suggests in one part answers taken without the working; in other

parts the issue is confused, and the objection finally made to Boeckh is a bold one to bring against such a master in the subject. It is merely a misconception of the problem, and among the arguments for it is an obvious *petitio principii*.

In the note on the motions of Mercury and Venus, he maintains against Martin with a great air of originality a view which Proclus mentions in more than one form in more than one passage: one passage being his commentary on this very place. It is true that the editor's first-hand acquaintance with Proclus is not of that intimate character which seems implied in such a judgment as he passes on him in his Introduction; but in a note of Martin's, which he has evidently used, special attention is drawn to this view as one given in Proclus. The editor's attack here on Martin is an instance of the method which vitiates his interpretation everywhere. He assumes Plato couldn't mean anything of difficulty, and makes rash generalisations about his infallibility in this respect which the *Timæus* itself confutes. The bit of modern astronomy (illustrated by a woodcut) which the editor quite needlessly adds, illustrates once more the dangers of unfamiliar ground. So also do the notes he adventures, in 31, on the mathematical sense of *δύναμις* and Greek treatment of number.

The note on the earth's rotation which follows the view, perhaps most widely accepted, that of Boeckh ('Boeckh's exhaustive and very masterly examination'), is distinguished by the unbecoming language with which Grote is attacked. The editor's addition *de suo* to what he calls 'Boeckh's crushing refutation' is not new. It is found already in a well known English Essay on the *Timæus* in a discussion as superior in matter to this note as it is in taste. The editor has his usual reward. Not only is there some strange logic in his argument, but he himself unconsciously adopts in a different form the very characteristic of Grote's theory which causes its well-known difficulty, and is only saved in appearance from the same difficulty by adopting a mistake of Martin's which he calls 'acute.' He takes a mistaken view of the Aristotelian passages on the subject, from which he might have been warned by Zeller's note and ought to have been warned by the Greek of the first of these passages.

In the passage on vision the author is very unfortunate. He calls Martin's view 'hopeless,' Martin construes rightly: the epithet belongs to the editor, who has gone

wrong throughout the passage: though he supposes that 'eschewing the comma, we get the right sense.' In the compass of one page of Greek here he makes five serious mistakes of translation.

We have already spoken of the origin of the note on respiration. The editor makes several mistakes in it on his own account, which with a number of others in the scientific matters we must pass by. Before proceeding to the philosophy in general we may notice the criticism of Aristotle.

With Aristotle, whom he attacks with the acrimony usually reserved for contemporaries, the editor is but imperfectly acquainted. The knowledge he has seems conditioned by the references of his predecessors: he mentions Pseudo-Aristotelian treatises as if genuine, *e.g.* he treats as Aristotle's what he calls 'the not very luminous (*sic*) treatise *De Coloribus*;' he nearly always misunderstands what he criticises, and makes errors which must rank as palmary.

We choose one passage in a simple matter involving no philosophy. The reader may judge from it the spirit in which the editor undertakes this part of his work and his fitness for it. The passage is in the editor's note on vision, where he has enough mishaps already. Plato makes vision partly due to light emitted from the eye, and, foreseeing the objection that if so we ought to see in the dark, says the light is quenched if it does not meet the kindred light of day. Aristotle raises the objection in question, and truly says that Plato has not met it. 'For how,' he asks in effect, 'can a ray of light be quenched? We understand how an object which emits light, *e.g.* a hot ember, can be quenched. But neither can darkness quench—that is done by cold or wet—nor can light be quenched, but only a burning object.' The criticism is obviously cogent: for if darkness quenched light, no illumination would be possible.

This is the editor's note: 'Plato explains quite clearly what he means by "extinguished." . . . Aristotle, however, catching at the word *κατασβέννυται*, asks *τίς γὰρ ἀπὸσβέσις φωτός ἐστιν*; κ.τ.λ. It is impossible to exonerate criticism of this kind from the charge of *ὀνομαζόντων θίψεως*.' Once more has the editor pointed out his own characteristics. He does it again when he says in another place of Aristotle's criticism of a theory, 'he simply ignores the whole point of it from beginning to end.' It is the editor's own case in relation to that part of Aristotle.

We must again plead want of space, and only indicate some of the other mistakes.

In a note on 52A, to the dogmatism and exaggeration of which quotation alone could do justice, the editor pits the 'intense vividness of Plato's insight' against the 'mistiness which pervades his (Aristotle's) whole thought,' on a matter where the Peripatetic answer is merely 'crushing' (to borrow a word from the editor). Plato may pray to be delivered from such friends. The editor has obviously been misled by a perverse desire to contradict a certain modern statement on the subject. The answer most commonly given by the editor to Aristotle is that his point of view is 'physical,' while Plato is treating a 'metaphysical' question. We can only infer from the places where this objection occurs that the editor does not understand the distinction of these two terms which he uses very freely; we suspect that he is not even aware that Aristotle's so called 'Physics' is a metaphysical treatise, like some of the others associated with it.

In the note on Space Aristotle is treated with contempt as misunderstanding Plato. Aristotle has understood the text; the editor's interpretation of it is an instance of some of the worst faults of his method. Apart from the remarks on Aristotle the whole system of the notes on Space is as remarkable for confusion as for confidence, whether we consider it in relation to the text or simply in relation to the manipulation of the philosophic conceptions discussed in it.

Of the editor's treatment of the philosophical part of the dialogue it is difficult to speak quite seriously. We have no prejudice against the attempt to understand ancient thought by the help of modern; we venture to believe that Plato and Aristotle are likely to be best understood by those who have an interest in modern metaphysics. But there is a stage in such interpretation which has brought discredit on it: a stage which the individual will still often have to go through, but out of date (we had hoped) in the progress of the race.

When a man with a new enthusiasm for some modern system of metaphysics begins to see, behind differences of formula, affinities between it and the doctrines of Plato and Aristotle, it sometimes happens that what to him is a discovery disorders the judgment, so that the reaction against the dull annalistic treatment results in an opposite extreme, almost as much to be deprecated. Ancient thought is crudely treated as if it were modern, and the natural sense of a text is either not seen at all or passed with contempt. To the

student himself something like finality seems achieved: but instead of being the end, it is not much beyond the beginning of critical interpretation: it is merely a stage before the development of a historic sense. It may nevertheless deserve respect, for all must begin, and all must wish charity for their own shortcomings. Yet it is difficult to entertain such a feeling, when this stage of development takes an attitude of authority, and of impatient peremptory dogmatism.

It is evident that for the enterprise of interpreting Plato in the light of modern conceptions there must be at least clear logical thinking, and a sense of what a passage meant for the man who wrote it, in distinction from its modern associations. We should hardly hope for these requisites in the editor: for in matters of ordinary exposition, involving no philosophy, his defects of common logic and consistency are too apparent. In the philosophy these characteristics have not affected minor matters only; we venture to think that the editor has missed his way seriously on the fundamental ones. We have hardly space here to discuss any of them adequately, and must be content to put the more salient points.

In the first place the *Timaeus* is regarded as if a system of thoroughly modern idealism. 'In the *Timaeus* the universe is conceived as the self-evolution of absolute thought. There is no more a distinction between mind and matter, for all is mind, &c.' Plato says nothing of this. The history of the interpretation of sacred and philosophical books proves however that anything may be got out of a text by assuming enough allegory. But Plato speaks at least sometimes without allegory about his philosophy in the *Timaeus*. It is at all events out of the question that he should entrust his supreme result to an allegory so obscure that it does not even suggest itself to the ordinarily careful student. What evidence therefore the editor finds must be matter of curiosity. He finds but few expressions in the text to argue from. We will select the one to which he himself attaches special importance. The argument based on it is enough to indicate the value of his speculations.

In 37 B, Plato says of the operation of right thinking in the spheres of sense (*αἰσθητόν*) and of reason *ὅταν μὲν περὶ τὸ αἰσθητὸν γίνηται . . . δόξαι καὶ πίστει γίγνεται βίβαιοι . . . ὅταν δὲ αὖ περὶ τὸ λογιστικὸν ἢ . . . νοῦς ἐπιστήμη τε ἐξ ἀνάγκης ἀποτελεῖται*. Of course Plato might have

written *ὅταν περὶ τὸ νοητὸν ἢ*, 'when thought is concerned with the objects of the reason.' *ὅταν περὶ τὸ λογιστικὸν ἢ*<sup>1</sup> is merely another way of saying the same thing, and only means 'when thought is concerned with the reasoning part of the soul.'

On this passage the editor says (after a mistaken argument from *νοητῶν* in 37 A), 'Still more remarkable is the use of *λογιστικὸν* below in 37 c. There is no other passage in Plato where *λογιστικὸν* is contrasted with *αἰσθητόν*: the regular term is of course *νοητόν*. It is surely impossible that Plato could have substituted *λογιστικὸν* for *νοητόν* until he had reached a period in his metaphysic where he deliberately affirmed the identity of thought and its object. I believe also the present use both of *νοητῶν* and of *λογιστικὸν* is purposely designed to draw attention to this.'

The editor means that because Plato put *τὸ λογιστικόν* where *νοητόν* would be expected, he means to teach the identity of the perceiving subject with the object. (We have given the obvious interpretation of the place.) It is difficult to imagine the state of mind which could attribute to Plato such a frigid and obscure device for conveying his meaning. We are reminded of the exploits of the discoverers of Shakespeare ciphers. The mere quotation however of such notes is the most effective criticism of them. But the climax is not reached till we put another note, that on 61 c. beside this one. It will be noticed that in the first clause of the present passage (37 B) Plato does not substitute *αἰσθητικόν* for *αἰσθητόν*, though according to the editor he identifies these two also. Why does not the editor follow out his own principle illustrated here and in a note on 92 c. (which we shall give presently), and see a profound meaning in the circumstance that while *λογιστικόν* is substituted for its object (*νοητόν*) in one of the two coordinate clauses *αἰσθητικόν* is not substituted for *αἰσθητόν* in the other clause, and give us some such note as this!—(the expressions in double quotation marks are all his own): "The minute correspondence" (between the two clauses) "seems to render the one important deviation all the more strikingly significant" . . . "Now the interpretation of this difference is in my judgment indubitably this." Plato means to tell us that he does not identify the *αἰσθητικόν* and the *αἰσθητόν*, and "I believe his present use of" *λογιστικόν* in one clause and *αἰσθητόν*

<sup>1</sup> One of the inferior MS. reads *αἰσθητικόν*. The editor does not mention this, and, as Stallbaum remarks, it may have been an alteration to suit *λογιστικόν*.



in the other "is purposely designed to draw attention to this." As it is, the editor passes in silence the difficulty which his method involves him in. Now in 61 c he had a remarkable opportunity of helping himself out of it, and it will be interesting to observe what use he makes of it. In 61 c *παθήματα αἰσθητικά* puzzles him. Through a mistake about an earlier passage he wrongly supposes *παθήματα* to mean qualities of the perceived object, and these he feels should be *αἰσθητά* not *αἰσθητικά*. If the thought had only occurred to him, we can imagine with what conviction he would have pointed out that here again Plato utters a word '*φωνᾶν συνεοίσαι*,' and by the substitution of *αἰσθητικά* for *αἰσθητά* teaches the identity of perception and its object. Unluckily the thought did not occur to him. He cancels as 'unmeaning' the reading which might have been fraught with such significance, and actually prints *αἰσθητά* in his text against all the MSS. The inference is irresistible. If there had been a Greek adjective *λογιστόν* used by Plato, related to *λογιστικόν* as *αἰσθητόν* to *αἰσθητικόν*, then in the former place, 37 c, the editor would have inevitably substituted *λογιστόν* for *λογιστικόν*, and never thought of his idealism.

The idealism based on such evidence—for the editor's other arguments are equally nugatory—is applied in the crudest manner to interpret the text. We refer the reader, for instance, to the note on 35 A, pp. 106-7, which should be given in full if space allowed. Moreover the editor actually ascribes to Plato the Kantian theory (though not *eo nomine*) that space and time are *a priori* forms of intuition. There is no trace of any such thing in Plato.

Similar principles are exemplified in the interpretation of the last words of the dialogue, which the editor thinks contain a great mystery.

The universe (*κόσμος*) is there said to be *ζῶον ὁρατόν . . . εἰκὼν τοῦ νοητοῦ*. Paris A and one inferior MS. read *ποιητοῦ* for *νοητοῦ*. The appropriateness of *νοητοῦ* (τοῦ *νοητοῦ ζῶου*) as opposed to *ὁρατόν* is obvious even without referring to the special theories of this dialogue, which elsewhere represents the Creator not as making the universe an *εἰκὼν* of himself, but of the *αὐτὸ ζῶον*, i.e. the *νοητὸν ζῶον*.

The editor thinks it vital to vindicate *ποιητοῦ*. Of its genuineness he says, 'I can feel no doubt whatever.' He thinks 'it is in the last degree improbable' that the familiar *νοητοῦ* should have been altered into *ποιητοῦ*; whereas if *ποιητοῦ* were the original

reading, 'it was positively certain to be altered in some way': partly because in the other corresponding parts of the dialogue it is the *νοητὸν ζῶον* which is said to be copied by the *κόσμος*, partly because 'the word *ποιητοῦ* must be necessarily unintelligible to any one' who had not arrived at the same view of the dialogue as the editor himself.

It is strange he cannot see how easy it is to reverse all this emphatic reasoning. If *νοητοῦ* had been the original, the sequel of the editor's own note shows that *ποιητοῦ* is exactly the alteration which a Neoplatonist would have liked to make, though we will not say it 'was positively certain' to be made. But also the corruption of *νοητική* into *ποιητική* is quite easy. Since this is so; since *νοητοῦ* is the reading of the great majority of MSS.; since it receives the strongest confirmation which it could have from the other parts of the dialogue—the editor unconsciously accentuates this when he says, 'this very minute correspondence seems to render the one important deviation (i.e. *ποιητοῦ* for *νοητοῦ*) all the more strikingly significant'—then, according to one of the most undisputed canons of criticism, the probabilities are all in favour of *νοητοῦ*. Thus we find such scholars as C. F. Hermann, Stallbaum, and the Zurich editors all reading *νοητοῦ*.

We will follow the note further. 'Adopting then *ποιητοῦ*,' it is said, 'we have of course but one possible inference to draw: the *δημιουργὸς* and the *αὐτὸ ζῶον* are one and the same, the *δημιουργὸς* being simply a mythical duplicate of the *αὐτὸ ζῶον*.' The reader may well wonder what conceivable motive Plato could have for hiding this identity till the last words of the dialogue. And to confide the revelation of a secret, which need never have been kept, to one single word, which the editor himself tells us would be 'positively certain' to be misunderstood, seems too poor a joke for an author of average sense—to say nothing of Plato.

The editor characteristically inverts this—'Surely,' he says, 'nothing can be more thoroughly characteristic of Plato than that, after talking parables throughout, he should at the very end of the dialogue drop one single word *φωνᾶν συνεοίσαι*, which was to open our eyes to the fact that he did speak in parables; that if we desire to understand the philosopher, we must be in sympathy with the poet.'

This is the sort of profession of esoteric knowledge of their author's characteristics by which such interpreters try to put common sense out of court. We will quote

another from the Introduction (§ 48). To meet the inevitable objections he says they would 'argue a complete absence of familiarity with Plato's method.' (Doubtless). 'Plato never wrote a handbook of his own philosophy.' (Do philosophers usually do this?) He naively adds that Plato 'will not do our thinking for us: he loves best to make us construct the edifice for ourselves from the materials with which he supplies us.'

Elsewhere the editor has formulated his own condemnation. He asks in reference to an interpretation of Martin's, 'Could Plato possibly expect any one to understand him if he made such use of language?'

Even if *ποιητοῦ* were read, it clearly could not be evidence of the idealism or the monism attributed by the editor to Plato.

Other points we can only touch upon. For instance the notes, confused and inconsistent, on *ἀνάγκη* maintain a monism counter to the clear sense of the reiterated statements of Plato. The editor has not yet felt the magnitude of the problem of evil. He gives the fatal criticism of such notes himself when he says of an interpretation<sup>1</sup> of Martin's, that if Plato had meant it 'surely he must have stated it with a little more definiteness.' Indeed a still more serious form of the objection lies against his general method. Why, if Plato meant these things, did he not only not say them, but choose the language natural to one who meant the opposite?

Again, as to the date of the dialogue—his idea that it belongs to a period much later<sup>2</sup> than the *Republic*, when *μέθεξις* had been dropped for *μίμνσις*, depends partly on a misconception of the place of these formulæ in Plato, partly on an extraordinary mistake about the *Parmenides*, partly on misinterpretation of passages in the *Timæus*. Nor (what is strange) does he seem to have even heard of a view, which the text itself should have suggested, that the opening of the dialogue strongly favours a date intervening between the two main divisions of the

*Republic*. He thus speaks with a light heart of an 'advanced ontology' in the *Timæus*, which is mere imagination. Chimerical also is the notion that in the supposed 'mature Platonism' of the *Timæus* the ideas were to be limited to ideas of living things. Apart from the absence of evidence for it, the editor omits to note that the *Parmenides*, the first, according to him, of 'the four great dialogues of the late period,' affirms with emphasis a doctrine which is the opposite of it. (It is the place where the young Socrates is told his difficulties come 'because you are still young; the time will come when philosophy will have a firmer grasp of you, if I am not mistaken.') Once more as to the idealism—an application of the very method used by the author to prove that *μέθεξις* is dropped in the *Timæus* would, by a comparison of the *Theætetus* and *Timæus*, commit him to the position that the subjective idealism in respect of the objects of sense supposed to be in the *Theætetus* has been dropped in the *Timæus*.

Lastly as to the opinion, in agreement with Neoplatonism, which the editor affirms so confidently—that the *Timæus* is the 'master-key' to the Platonic system, Plato's highest result and final solution of his metaphysical problems—it seems but an illusion to which the modern student is at first as liable as a Neoplatonist. We at first naturally think that what in a philosopher comes nearest to the problems most important to us was most important to him: but this is often a mistake. The only safe guide is the philosopher himself: and Plato ought to be heard. He does not speak as in the *Republic*: or represent himself as approaching a crowning piece of metaphysic. On the contrary he tells us again and again that the subject of the *Timæus* deals with mere probability at best, and he puts it on a lower level. But such commentators always know better than the author. (Of this, by the way, there is an amusing instance in the note on 29 c, 'The modesty of *Timæus* led him rather unduly to depreciate his physical theories: it would be hard, I think, to find inconsistencies in them.' We need but contrast the editor's own note on 67 E, where, after labouring in vain to reconcile some of these theories, he at last confesses 'the consequence [stated by Plato] seems equally hard to deduce from any interpretation of Plato's corpuscular theory.')<sup>3</sup>

Plato had much affinity to *Parmenides*, and there is a striking parallel between the lower position which Plato gives the phenomenology of the *Timæus* in his system, and

<sup>1</sup> The objection is fatal to the editor in the particular place where he makes it (56 D.). The one sentence in which he gets near the words to be explained, he has had to withdraw in an erratum. Doubtless he saw it had involved him in an elementary mathematical mistake.

<sup>2</sup> In this connexion it may be noticed that the consideration by which the editor thinks he can 'dispose of Zeller's theory of particulars immanent in the ideas' only shows a misunderstanding of the problem. Zeller was quite aware of this consideration and many like it, as appears at once from this part of his account of Plato.

the insignificance which Parmenides attaches to his own account of the phenomenal world, as compared with the part of his poem on true Being.

In excuse for such an edition, it may perhaps be pleaded that it is, as the editor says, the first English one. But there is the pity of it. As to the greater part of the commentary, we regret that English work should have begun with an inaccurate compilation from foreign sources. As to the philosophy, which in matter and manner is a sort of modern Neoplatonism, it would be

depressing if foreign critics thought the book at all representative, and supposed that the study of Plato in England had not yet advanced beyond this uncritical stage.

Fortunately, however, valuable help on the *Timaeus* is to be had from English sources. There is also a considerable discussion of the dialogue in the translated part of Zeller's monumental work, the importance of which from an educational point of view and for purposes of independent study is well known. We have learnt it still better by contrast.

J. COOK WILSON.

#### T. MACCI PLAUTI AULULARIA.

*T. Macci Plauti AULULARIA, texte Latin, publié d'après les travaux les plus récents, avec un Commentaire critique et explicatif et une Introduction, par ALEXANDRE BLANCHARD. Paris, Klincksieck, 1888. 3 fcs.*

THE title-page of this edition would lead one to expect a text based upon the masterly edition of Goetz (1881), with such improvements as have been suggested during the seven years which have since elapsed (e.g. by Leo in his edition of 1885), and such contributions as the editor has to offer of his own. M. Blanchard however has preferred the more arduous and ambitious course of constructing his text entirely *de novo*. In the preface he states his method as follows: 'Un éditeur de Plaute doit avoir lu les commentateurs, connaître leurs conjectures, les goûter selon leur valeur, mais les négliger le plus souvent pour s'en tenir à la lettre des manuscrits, du moins toutes les fois que cela est possible.' The principle here laid down is unexceptionable; but what is possible and what is impossible in Plautine criticism is a question of evidence, which must be answered according to the lights of the critic. The present volume does not give one the impression that M. Blanchard has himself entered into a minute and laborious examination of the usage of Plautus or that he has a wide experience of MSS. One is rather led to infer that by the time he reaches a second edition he will be inclined to modify his views on a number of passages and will probably find himself more in harmony with doctrines which at present hold the field. At any rate his introduction and notes ought to have stated

more explicitly than they do the grounds of his dissent. One would like to know on what principle he can justify his reading in line 81, *Redi nunc jam intro* in view of line 327, where under precisely similar circumstances he reads *Tace nunc iam tu*: in both passages the MSS. have *nunc iam*, and the line begins with an iambic word. Again, is it not inconsistent to read (with the MSS., but in defiance of the metre) *Meae fidei tuaeque rei* in line 121, while accepting the obvious correction *filiae* for *filiae* in 372 and 797? It is hard to reconcile with M. Blanchard's general principles the change of the MS. reading *sunt* into *sint* (368), a change which seemed unnecessary to Goetz and to Wagner in his second edition (cf. Rud. 304): one wants to know the editor's grounds for suspecting 648 to be corrupt. In regard to the scansion of line 47 can the editor explain his two statements (i.) that *modo* forms two short syllables: (ii.) that the first syllable of *incedit* is short? He scans 655 *Mānē mān- | ē quīs ille | est*, etc., though in the very next line he recognizes that *ille*, even with the ictus on it, may be a pyrrhic; the scansion *mānē mān- | ē quīs ille | est*, etc., is in accordance with a well-known law as to variation of accent in two successive iambic words. In the explanatory notes the editor has hardly used his space to the best advantage. We are informed three times over that *sis* = *si vis*. In 129 *utrique* is most simply regarded as a dative, not a genitive. In 606 *omni* = *ulla* (not *nulla*).

E. A. SONNENSCHN. E.

## THE SATIRES AND EPISTLES OF HORACE.

*The Satires and Epistles of Horace.* Edited, with notes, by J. B. GREENOUGH. Ginn & Co. 1888. \$1.25.

THIS book has been prepared on a theory which has impressed itself on the make-up of the page. In the preface we read 'The notes are put at the bottom of the page to facilitate reference. The editor is persuaded that college students sufficiently advanced to undertake Horace ought no longer to get and recite lessons, but to study the literature, and understand, and enjoy it.'

Now we believe that it is both honourable and useful for a college student 'to get and recite lessons.' What is always and everywhere to be frowned upon is the reciting without getting; and there is no doubt that notes at the bottom of the page have sometimes contributed to this result. The interpretation of an author, be it Horace or Shakespeare, from a clean page, by a student that has mastered it, is an intellectual exercise—whether you call it reciting or not—worthy of the best college minds. This of course must not exclude sight-reading, which, however, belongs quite as much to elementary as to advanced study. We presume that the publishers will furnish clean pages of Horace, if there is a demand for them, but we infer from the preface that the influence of the editor will be against it. His page-theory and his theory of annotation go together. He has furnished notes many of which can be under the student's eye in the class-room without harm to his independence, because they are suggestive and stimulative rather than exhaustive. Whether the English or German plan of placing notes is, on the whole, the better, we will not now discuss, but we take pleasure in saying that the plan adopted in this book has been well carried out. The editor himself seems to have been stimulated by it to work the suggestive method to its best. His notes are brief, often sententious. They give the drift of thought more than the construction of words. They illustrate rather than translate; but the translations of words and phrases are happy, and in English. Best of all, the interpretations seems to us generally correct.

While all this is true, and could be copiously exemplified, we find some drawbacks. This confining of the notes to what may be called over-the-shoulder help gives them an appearance of meagreness that we

do not look for in a perfect Horace. There is very little discussion. In particular, the history of Horatian study and criticism receives scant honour. One advantage of classical study is found in the fruitful contact with the enthusiastic learning which has been bestowed on the classics. Horace has been peculiarly honoured in his illustrious succession of commentators. Now we could not ask a modern editor to cumber his notes with all the good work, and some of the rubbish, of his predecessors. We do not even allow him to indulge in a Bentleian love of controversy, but Horatian scholarship deserves recognition, and we do not recall a classical edition for advanced students that so nearly ignores previous commentators as this of Professor Greenough. Both the introduction and the notes impress us unpleasantly in this respect.

Again, full citations of illustrative passages referred to go well with notes at the bottom of the page, for they can be used to advantage in the class-room. What the editor can do is well shown in the note on *contractusque leget* (Ep. I. vii. 12.). But this fine example is not generally followed; and the deficiency is the more noticeable because the Odes, to which there are numerous references, are not in this volume.

We are not quite satisfied with the special introductions. Least satisfactory of all is the introduction to the journey to Brundisium. As between the dates 40 and 37 B.C. the editor prefers the latter, but takes no notice of a third date so ably urged by Schütz and endorsed by Palmer. Schütz may be wrong in supposing that the occasion was the visit of Maecenas to Antony at Athens in 38, but it is certainly wrong to ignore him, and to give us, as the only authority, the old discussion of Kirchner.

We must say, further, that we hoped for a more distinctively literary editing than we find. The preface warns us against subordinating Horace to the Latin language. We agree, we will bid good-bye to the grammar, and will forget that one of the best literary commentaries on Shakespeare is Abbott's *Shakespearian Grammar*. Literary study is promoted by judicious criticism, by discussion of sources and by comparison with other authors. Of all this we have something. We hoped for more. In the *Ars Poetica* of our college days that reference to Pope and Boileau was a small matter, but it made us feel that somehow Horace had



a place in the literary history of the world. Prof. Greenough has not left even that little germ of literary fruitfulness, and he has omitted all reference to Aristotle in his comments on the terse delineation of the ages of man (vr. 156—178).

We miss an index to the notes. If a systematic treatise requires an index, how much more does a body of desultory notes on forty-one disconnected poems. For example, the beginner in Horace has a right to be referred to the explanation of *quatenus* (*Sat. I. i. 64*), with its happy comparison to the English *inasmuch as*, especially as his Harper's Dictionary does not cite this passage.

All this fault-finding shall not weaken our commendation. The good things that we have make us wish for more. But for the cost of a large volume we doubtless should have had more. The *columnae Sosio-*

*rum* must be respected. But Horace makes high demands. He has been studied so long and so fondly that he will not, at this late day, let his editors off easily. Why can we not for once suspend the new law that condemns our school-classics to be edited in tid-bits, and have all the poems arranged in one volume in chronological order? This arrangement, after all allowance for obscurity of date, would be of itself an historical and literary commentary. Then the student would not come to the famous journey with his head full of events that happened from twenty to thirty years later. Then the Epodes and Satires would so introduce the Odes and Epistles that a more truthful impression would be made of Horace, 'His Mind and Art.'

L. S. POTWIN,

Western Reserve University.

#### HARNACK'S DE ALEATORIBUS.

*Texte und Untersuchungen*, 5 Band. Heft i. Der Pseudocyprianische Tractat de Aleatoribus die älteste Lateinische Christliche Schrift. Ein werk des Römischen Bischofs Victor I. (Saec. ii.). Von ADOLF HARNACK. 1888. 4 Mk. 50.

THIS dissertation of Harnack's is a remarkable proof of the wide influence of the discovery of the *Didaché*. In the investigation into the history of the last-named document it was noticed that the only distinct quotation in western literature is found in a tract *De Aleatoribus*, which is contained in some MSS. of Cyprian's works of later date than 800, and in editions since 1564.<sup>1</sup> This tract, on the perils of gambling, appears to be an address to the faithful generally, clerics and laymen alike. It is written in the vulgar dialect, and it may be noticed that two out of five letters (A.D. 250) included in the Cyprianic correspondence, composed in the same dialect, came from Rome, and in several ways resemble our tract. The tract however cannot be Cyprian's, partly because of its literary style, and partly because in speaking of the

<sup>1</sup> It is worth while to suggest that this tract may have been connected with Cyprian's name, not only because of numerous coincidences in language (for this would apply to Tertullian as much as to Cyprian), but in particular because of the phrase (ch. 8) 'licet non sacrifices, lege hujus facinoris particeps es.'

episcopate there is a conspicuous absence of many expressions characteristic of Cyprian.

In the position of the tract towards the Canon there is an indication of an earlier date. The *Shepherd of Hermas* is quoted as Scripture (*dicit enim Scriptura Divina: vae erit pastoribus...ch. ii.*). This appears to show, argues Harnack, that the writing belongs to the age of Irenaeus, Tertullian, and Callixtus. Harnack however does not meet a difficulty suggested by the Muratorian Canon. He both minimises its rejection of the *Shepherd*, and also assigns the document to the beginning of the third century. The words of the fragment (*nuperrime temporibus nostris...sedente cathedra urbis Romae ecclesiae Pio episcopo*) seem absolutely to require an earlier date by a quarter of a century. If then this fragment be taken (as Harnack allows) to represent the views of the Church of Rome on the Canon, here is an objection against his supposition in regard to the authorship of the *De Aleatoribus* which requires further sifting. Again, in the midst of quotations from St. Paul and one from the *Shepherd* (!) the writer (ch. 4) with the somewhat unusual phrase *in doctrinis Apostolorum est* introduces a sentence which without verbal exactness welds together two passages from the *Didaché*. There are resemblances also between the list of sins (ch. 5) in the *De Aleatoribus* and

that in the *Didaché*. These indications, together with the evidence derived from the following points: the severity with which the writer views gambling as connected with heathen observances, the absence of the technical phrase, used by Tertullian, *crimen mortale* (but should not Harnack note the practical equivalent *delicti vulnus insanabile*, ch. 5, comp. ch. 10?), the representation of the faithful as in the midst of heathendom, out of which they themselves had been brought, the use of the vulgar dialect—this on the one hand, on the other the development of the episcopal and sacerdotal position, seem to point to the years 190—230 as the limits of date.

But the possibilities can be narrowed. The fact that the writer addressed himself to all Christians in the name of all bishops shows that he spoke from one of the great sees of the west, i.e. Rome or Carthage. The latter supposition is possible, but we know of no bishop in North Africa before Cyprian of character and position sufficiently strong. The former hypothesis has much to recommend it. It fits in with the phenomena now to be noticed. (1) Great emphasis is laid on the bishop's position. Now Tertullian in his *De Pudicitia* fiercely attacks Callixtus for assuming the like authority, and at first sight this coincidence seems to point to Callixtus as the author. But the fact that Hippolytus, the rival of Callixtus, advances similar claims shows that they were the inheritance and not the invention of Callixtus. Again, in our tract we seem to see an earlier crisis of development, because the writer, though he evidently has his own position mainly in his mind, yet has not passed beyond the stage of applying this exalted language to all bishops. Thus the date will probably be before 218 A.D. (2) We remark the uncompromising sternness of the writer. He boldly rebukes vice in high quarters, and does not hesitate to speak of *excommunication*. But the keynote of Callixtus' policy was laxity, if we may believe (and here Harnack seems to make no allowance for the fact that this representation comes to us only through two deadly enemies of the Roman bishop) Hippolytus and Tertullian.

Callixtus then can hardly be the author of the *De Aleatoribus*. Zephyrinus was too poor a creature, if again we believe Hippolytus, to write a document so full of force. Is Victor the author? While no argument can be adduced against this supposition, many make for it; briefly these. In the Easter Controversy Victor took upon himself to address the whole of Christendom, and to excommunicate those who differed from himself. Further, he excommunicated Theodotus, the Presbyters Blastus and Florinus, perhaps also, after favouring them for a time, and thus showing his sympathy with their stern view of the world, the Montanists. Again, Eusebius expressly tells us that in the reign of Commodus Christians had rest from persecution, and that the Church in Rome gained large accessions from the ranks of the rich and noble. The *De Aleatoribus* seems to reflect such a position in such phrases as the following: *ut quos nemo persequitur se ipsos invidia persequantur* (ch. 6); *censum et adparatus tuos omnes ad studium ecclesiae distrahe . . . fundos et villas tuas justa operatione ad paradysum remove* (ch. 11). Again, Jerome in more than one place speaks of Victor as an author, and mentions him as the first among Latin Christian writers. Lastly, the *Liber Pontificalis* has the note *Victor natione Afer*, a note which suggests a possible explanation of the numerous coincidences in thought and language between the *De Aleatoribus* and the writings of Tertullian and Cyprian.

Such a brief summary necessarily omits many of Harnack's more minute but telling arguments. If we have here Victor's work, it offers many points of extreme interest, both historical and linguistic. (1) It presents us with a curious, if unpleasant, view of the Church in Rome. (2) It expresses the view of a remarkable Roman bishop on the questions of the Papacy and the Episcopate at a turning-point in the development of both. (3) It gives an example of vulgar Latin. (4) It is the earliest known specimen of Christian Latin. (5) In spite of great inexactness in quotation, it supplies the earliest known evidence in regard to the old Latin text in use in Italy.

F. H. CHASE.

#### NOTES ON THE TEXT AND DATE OF THE *DE ALEATORIBUS*.

It has been universally recognized that the opening words of this treatise as they stand in the MSS. are corrupt. Hartel prints them thus:

\* \* magna nobis ob universam fraterni-

tatem cura est, fideles, maxime et rea perditorum omnium audacia id est aleatorum, animos ad nequitiam† se in lacum [inlatu Codd.] mortis emergunt.

For this Professor Wölfflin in the last

number of his *Archiv. f. lat. Lexikographie*, v. 493, proposed to read as follows:

*Magna nobis ob universam fraternitatem cura est, fideles, maxime ex saeva [or tetra] perditorum hominum audacia [id est aleatorum], qui animos ad nequitiam se in lacum [or lacu] mortis demergunt.* Accepting most of these corrections, may we not carry them a step further, keeping in one case somewhat nearer to the MSS., and in another gaining in simplicity and ease of construction? *Magna nobis ob universam fraternitatem cura est, fideles, maxime ex ea perditorum hominum audacia qui animosi ad nequitiam se in lacu mortis demergunt.*

By a revised estimate of the MSS. (with which in the main I agree, though I doubt if the true title of the treatise was *Adversus Aleatores*), Professor Wölflin has happily recovered a number of vernacular forms which were in danger of being lost. I strongly suspect, however, that he has overlooked one which not only adds a new form, but a new word to our dictionaries. In his own *Archiv.* 1, 70, Dr. P. Thielmann proposed to read in cap. 2 *neturam* with DQ<sup>1</sup> for *nitorem* of M<sup>2</sup> and the editors. In this I believe him to have been perfectly right, but I doubt if he was equally right in his explanation of *neturam*. He took it to be a vernacular corruption of *nituram* (= *nitorem*). Is it not rather correct as it stands, and a derivative, as yet unregistered, of *neo*? This will give an excellent sense. The whole sentence runs thus: *quo magis a nobis cotidie perscrutentur, ut medicamine caelesti adhibito uellera eis florida crescant qui [leg. quae] ad neturam uestis caelestis proficiant* ('which may serve for the weaving of a celestial robe'). I would keep the same word in the Amiatine rendering of Ecclus. vi. 31: it would then be a precise equivalent of the Greek κλώσμα (καὶ οἱ δεσμοὶ αὐτῆς κλώσμα ὑακίνθινον LXX. = *et vincula illius netura salutaris* Cod. Amiatinus; *alligatura* Edd.). Dr. Thielmann (*ut. sup.* p. 68) alters it to *nectura*—I cannot but think unnecessarily: the two passages support each other.

Professor Wölflin holds that the treatise is not so old as the time of Victor (Bishop of Rome in the years 189—199 A.D.), to whom Harnack attributes it. His arguments are mainly two: (1) linguistic, from the occurrence in the treatise of certain words which really point to a time later, though perhaps not much later, than Cyprian. I would only myself lay stress upon three, which he puts forward most prominently: *oraculum* (= *oratorium*, 'place of prayer': see also Rönisch, *Semasiologische Beiträge*, p. 52

f.); *deitas*, for which both Arnobius and Augustine apologise as a novelty; and *deificus* (in the phrase *studio deifico*, which reminds us of *scripturae deificae* in another Pseudo-Cyprianic treatise, *De Montibus Sina et Sion*, cc. 1, 11). (2) The second argument is drawn from the recurrence in the *De Aleatoribus* of three distinct groups of Biblical quotations which are found in the *Ad Fortunatum*, *De Lapsis*, and *Testimonia* of Cyprian. Dr. Harnack has something to say in reply on all of these points (see *Theol. Literaturzeitung*, 1889, no. 1, cols. 3—5). If they each stood alone they might not be insuperable; but combined, they seem to go far to decide the question.

And yet a third argument may be added to them. I went carefully through the Biblical quotations in the *De Aleatoribus* last term with a small class who were interested in the subject; and though the results are rather less clear with a revised text than with that which was used by Harnack, there is, I think, sufficient to show that the general character of the quotations is not older than Cyprian but in some respects suggests a date, or at least a stage in the history of the text, which is rather later than his. This part of Dr. Harnack's investigation left something to be desired. Our data may perhaps be published if there should be room for them in the new volume of *Studia Biblica* which we hope shortly to send to the press.

W. SANDAY.

P.S.—Almost as I write, two articles reach me by Dr. J. Haussleiter, developing and enforcing the second of Wölflin's arguments mentioned above, and replying to Harnack. Dr. Haussleiter puts forward the view that the treatise may have been written in the name of the Roman Church by Celerinus, the confessor, from whom certainly one and possibly two letters have come down to us in the Cyprianic Collection (Epp. 21 and 8 in Hartel's edition). It seems to me that a good case is made out on the negative side but not on the positive. The treatise must, I think, have been written by a bishop, but Celerinus at the time of his confession was not even a cleric: it was written at a time of peace (so rightly Harnack, *T. u. U. v.* 118), but Haussleiter would put it in the years 249—251 A.D., in the heat of the Decian persecution: one of the two quotations in Ep. 8 happens to coincide with one in *De Aleat.* c. 3, and where Celerinus has *diligo*, the treatise significantly and consistently with

the rest of its text has *amo* (= Cod. Palat.). The choice appears to me to lie between a successor of Cyprian at Carthage and a Roman bishop who used what is commonly called an African text, though it was not really confined to Africa. The next African

after Victor in the Roman see was Miltiades, bishop in 310—314 A.D., and he would perhaps be worth considering among the possible candidates for the authorship of the treatise.

### CORPUS GLOSSARIORUM LATINORUM.

*Corpus Glossariorum Latinorum*, Vol. II. *Glossae Latino-Graecae et Graeco-Latinae*. Ediderunt GEORGIUS GOETZ et GOTTHOLDUS GUNDERMANN. Accedunt minora utriusque linguae Glossaria. Leipzig: Teubner, 1888. 3 Mk. 60.

As has often happened before with works of this character, circumstances have made it convenient to publish the second volume before the first. In this case the reader will have little or no reason to complain, as the greater part of the glossaries contained in this volume form a homogeneous whole, which can be studied separately with profit.

It must be said at once that this edition is one of the most important and valuable contributions to Latin philology which have been made in recent years. Before proceeding to consider it in detail, it may be convenient, for the sake of the general reader of the classics, to state generally in what the importance of Latin glossaries consists; especially as our editors have left the discussion of the question to the first volume. To do this it is only necessary to draw in outline the history which is revealed by an examination of their contents.

The first stage in this history is marked by the ancient pure Latin glossaries, compiled perhaps in the third and fourth centuries A.D., if not earlier. Most of these are lost in their original form, but much of them remains in later compilations; and a fair idea of their character may be formed from the Glosses of Placidus, and those edited from the seventh century Vatican MS. in the sixth volume of Mai's *Auctores Classici* (see Löwe, *Prodromus Glossariorum*, p. 143 foll.). These glossaries were compiled for school purposes, and were in all probability based upon really old collections, such as the lexicon of Verrius Flaccus and perhaps the *Stromateus* of Caesellius Vindex. A second stage is reached by the Latin-Greek glossaries, founded undoubtedly on pure Latin glossaries. These were probably

compiled after Constantinople had become the capital of the empire; just as comparisons of Greek and Latin forms were introduced into the pure Latin grammars after the same event. From these Latin-Greek glossaries the grammarians copied their *Idiomata Generum*, or comparisons of Greek and Latin words having the same meaning, but different genders (e.g. *processus*, προκοπή). The third stage is that of the early middle age, when different glossaries were massed into large collections like the *Liber Glossarum*, and when Latin, Latin-Greek, Graeco-Latin, Latin-Hebrew, and Latin-German vocabularies were patched up together.

This being the general course of their history, it follows that, although the older the glossary is the better, hardly any glossary is to be despised. There is always a chance of finding gold among the rubbish.

The most important part of the volume before us is the reprint from the MSS. of the Latin-Greek and Graeco-Latin glossaries, which have popularly, though wrongly, borne the names respectively of Philoxenus and Cyrillus. Of these glossaries there has been no regular edition since that of Vulcanius (1600). For Labbé's collection, in which 'Philoxenus,' 'Cyrillus,' 'Excerpta Stephani,' and a worthless modern *Onomasticon*, are mixed up in one mass, is only an embarrassment to the student.

The Latin-Greek glossary is now edited by Goetz and Gundermann, from the Parisian MS. 7651, of the ninth century. The preface contains a full discussion of the merits of other manuscripts—(a) The copies of Parisinus 7651, viz. Parisinus 7652 (sixteenth century); the Vossian of the seventeenth (Cod. Voss. Misc. Lat. 1, part 5); and the excerpts made by Saumaise, and contained in the Parisian 7683. A lost St. Germain MS., which was the source of Parisinus 7653, of some excerpts by Scaliger and Daniel, and of Estienne's edition of 1573, is in the opinion of an editor not identical



with the Parisian 7651 (as Rudorff thought), but copied from it, and therefore worthless for the emendation of the text.

The Graeco-Latin glossary ('Cyrilli') is edited from the Harleian MS. 5792 (seventh century), of which a full description and discussion is given in the preface, pp. xxi. foll. The ninth-century Laon MS. of the same glossary is a copy of a copy of the Harleian (p. xxix.). These two glossaries are followed by four sets of *Idiomata Generum*; (a) that of the Harleian MS. 5792: (b) the so-called 'Glossae Servii,' edited from the Harleian 2773 (twelfth century) and a lost *Puteaneus* copied by Labbé, and from Labbé, at second hand, by Burmann: (c) the *Idiomata* of the Naples MS. of Charisius and the eighth century Parisian MS. 7530, already edited by Keil in the fourth volume of his *Grammatici Latini*: (d) more *Idiomata* from the same Paris MS. Besides these we have the short Graeco-Latin glossary of Laon (No. 444), the papyrus fragments of Helmstadt and Cologne, and the *Glossae Nominum* already edited in part by Löwe, but now completed with the aid of the Peterhouse MS. of the twelfth century.

These editions aim merely at exhibiting the MS. text of the glossaries and *Idiomata*, the task of emendation being reserved for a later volume. Meanwhile all scholars will be deeply grateful for a volume which presents these important glossaries in the oldest form in which we can get them, and thus continues the work so admirably begun by Löwe in his *Prodromus Glossariorum*.

I conclude by offering, for what they are worth, the following emendations:

Glossae Graeco-Latinae, p. 6, l. 2, *abolit*, ἐπίθμει. Read *avet*, βούλεται, ἐπίθμει. Ib. l. 35, *adescit*, κολλατε. Read *adhaesit*, κολλᾷται. P. 9, l. 43, *adstringitfini*, σφίγγει. Read *adstringit*, πιέζει, σφίγγει. P. 17, l. 3, *antas*, γηρονσία. Read *anitas*, γήρας. Ib. l. 22, *anni*, γηράσσει. Read *anet*, γηράσκει. P. 18, l. 43, *aquilio*, κέντρον. Read *aculeus*. P. 19, l. 29, *apicus*, ὀπικιστής, ὡς Ἰουβενάλιος. Read *opicus* (referring to Juvenal's *opici pures*). P. 38, l. 4, *dedeum*, φυνίκιον. Read perhaps *Tyrium*, φουνίκιον. P. 40, l. 27, *deferdiā*, κόμισον. Read *differ*, διακόμισον. P. 53, l. 5, 6, *disponit*, κατατάσσει, διατυποῖ. *disipit*, *dirigit*, παραφρονεῖ. Read *disponit*, *dirigit*, κατατάσσει, διατυποῖ. *Desipit*, παραφρονεῖ. P. 55, l. 18, *domnedius* et *caenacularius*,

σταθμοῦχος. Et probably stands for i.e., and the original gloss was *domnedius*, *caenacularius*. P. 69, l. 52, *facillare*, στραγγαλίσαι. Read *faucillare* or *focillare*. P. 91, l. 30, *iocenera*, ἕτερα. Read *iocinera*, ἡπατα. P. 92, l. 22, 23, *irquitatus*, νηπιότατος. *Irkuis*, τραγούπαις ἀρχηγήβιοςος. Read *infans*, νηπιότατος. *Hirquitallus*, τραγόπαις, ἄρρην ἡβηκός. P. 96, l. 6, *caquillus*, ἀετός. Read *hic aquilus*: compare the Paris *Idiomata*, p. 550, l. 1, *hic capez*, πυρκαῖα, probably for *hic apex*. P. 99, l. 35, *cebe*, πάντα. Perhaps *ceveo*, σαίνω. P. 102, l. 15, *clores*, ἰάπνξ ἀνεμος. Read *caurus*. Ib. l. 42, *cotis*, ὀργή, ἀκόνη, ἰποδερμῖς. Read *κότος*, ὀργή: *cos*, ἀκόνη: *culis*, ἐπίδερμῖς. P. 103, l. 7, *cohibentia*, ραθύμια, συνοχή. Read *coniventia*, ραθυμία: *cohibentia*, συνοχή. P. 120, l. 44, *lemuriliae*, ἑορταὶ τῆς ἀστίας. *Lemurilia*, ἑορταὶ τῆς Ἑκάτης seems to be indicated by the Amplonian gloss quoted by Löwe (*Prodromus Glossariorum*, p. 193), '*lemuriam*' *dies festes letitiae* (= *Hecatae*). P. 127, l. 29, *marcidat et marcerat*. Read *marcidat*, i. e. *macerat*: the original form of the gloss being *marcidat*, *macerat*. So p. 129, l. 39, *minime curat et negligit* = *minime curat*, *neglegit*: p. 133, l. 16, *negat et recusat* = *negat*, *recusat*. P. 134, l. 56, *noxam dedit*, εἰς κόλασιν δέδωκεν. Read *in noxam*. The same corruption is found in Digest 9, 3, 1, 1, *noxam dedere*. P. 142, l. 14, *pariolus*, προφητής. Read *fariorius*. P. 160, l. 13, *procludim*, τέρας. Read *prodigium*. P. 162, l. 25, *propalare*, ἀναχρονίσαι. Perhaps *protelare*, ἀναχρονίσαι. *Propalare*, ἀνακουῶσαι. P. 163, l. 45, *proverbium*, ἐπίρρημα, παροιμία. Read *praeverbium*, ἐπίρρημα. *Proverbium*, παροιμία. P. 165, l. 31, *putacilla*, κάταπνυσμα. Read *sputatilla*, κάταπνυστά. P. 171, l. 30, *relga togiae*, τῆς ἀποδείξεως. Read *aretalogiae*, τῆς ἀποδείξεως. P. 181, l. 30, *sedulus efficiolus*. Read *sedulus*, *officiosus*. P. 195, l. 2, *tacte*, πάγκακος. Read *tacter*. Ib. l. 47, *tetrus*, σκοτεινός, ἀμυρός. Read *tectus*. P. 209, l. 2, *vindigestae*, τὰ ἐν ἀμφισβητήσει πράγματα. Read *vindiciae res*. P. 250, l. 53, *aūlas*, *sulcus*, *haecura*. Read *haec lira*.

Glossae Graeco-Latinae, p. 255, l. 53. Βαρβαρισμός, *haec greco latio*. Read perhaps *barbara oratio*. P. 261, l. 47, γαῖλος ποιμενικὸν ἀγγεῖον, *hoc signum*. Read *hoc sinum*. P. 295, l. 8, ἐλέφας . . . *boeluca*. Read *bos luca*.

H. NETTLESHIP.

## LINGUISTIC STUDIES BY JOHN AND THEODORE BAUNACK.

*Studien auf dem Gebiete des griechischen und der arischen Sprachen.* BAUNACK, JOHANNES und THEODOR. Erster Band. Leipzig, S. Hirzel. I. Theil, 1886, 6 Mk.; II. Theil, 7 Mk. 1888.

THE recent appearance of the second part completes now the first volume of this bibliographical venture of the Baunack brethren. They evidently expect to have a good deal to say, and want a serial of their own to say it in. As early as 1885 appeared a most creditable sample of their joint labours, an edition of the inscription of Gortyn—the best and most serviceable of the numerous editions which have sprung into existence since Halbherr's famous discovery. In the volume before us, the younger brother is represented in one article only, occupying about 175 of the 475 pages of the volume. This is an extremely important Avestan study, the results of which will have a direct bearing upon the determination of Zoroaster's relation to the native folk-cults of the Iranian people.

It is however in the work of the elder brother, Johannes, that the readers of this journal will have the most interest. It is work of such merit that it should not be lost sight of, though certainly this form of publication renders it more liable to be, than if it were embodied in one of the standard journals like Kuhn's *Zeitschrift* or Bezzenger's *Beiträge*.

Of most uniform excellence and perhaps of most permanent value is the collection and explanation of the inscriptions recently excavated from the temple of Asklepios at Epidauros. Many of these are of first-rate importance both from a linguistic and an antiquarian point of view; cf. e.g. the account of the miraculous cures effected in the temple as recorded in inscr. Nos. 59 and 80. Baunack's annotation is rich in citations of parallel passages from literature and inscriptions, and abounds in fine observations of linguistic peculiarities.

A miscellany of various discussions and observations under forty or more separate titles, grouped in two collections of 'Analekten,' occupies somewhat less than one-third the space of the volume. These are by no means of uniform value. Many of them disport themselves upon the enchanted ground of the etymology of proper names. Rarely do his results attain to a conviction, but surely he abounds in devices and clever

ideas. The most satisfactory of his discussions in this field are those which deal with the clipped names (*Koseformen*) in extension of Fick's treatment, *Griechische Personennamen* (Göttingen, 1874). He presents on pp. 58 ff. and 231 ff. a valuable collection of these clipped forms, which include, beside the first element of the original compound, a trace of the initial sounds of the second element; thus, Πολυ-ξ-ώ: Πολυ-ξ-ένη, Τηλε-φ-ος: Τηλε-φ-άνης, Μενε-σθ-εύς: Μενε-σθ-ένης, Πολυ-ξ-ίδας: Πολύ-ξ-ενος, Θεό-γν-ις: \*Θεό-γν-ητος, &c. Most interesting also is the discussion of names with doubled consonant like Ξενοκ-κώ, Βιοτρίς, &c., a discussion which is here continued from the author's investigation in the *Studia Nicolaitana* (Leipzig, 1884), pp. 47 f.

Of the various attempts at the determination of phonetic laws, none appears to me more successful than that on pp. 239 ff., in which it is shown that in Elean, and probably also generally in common speech, the simple initial τ might, before nouns beginning with a vowel, officiate in place of the fuller form of the article, τὸν, τοῦ, &c.; in the same way h' for δ, ἡ, &c. This leads to a not improbable explanation, certainly the only explanation thus far offered, of the aspiration in ἵππος (*áqva-s*, *egvus*), ἡμερα (*ἡμαρ*, *τετρ-ἡμερος*), &c., i.e. it resembles the l in Fr. *lierre* (= *l'hierre*, *hedera*).

The identification of the negation *ne* in νέ-κταρ (*κτείνω*) must be accepted; perhaps, too, in *vérodes*. The etymology of ἀγαθός as 'sehr laufend' (cf. βοη-θός) is no more convincing than Johansson's rehabilitation of the old one with Goth. *gōds* (Bezz. *Beitr.* xiii. 115 f.). The attempt to find the meaning 'water' in Σάμος is by no means set upon its feet by Σαμο-θράκη, nor is the aphaeresis from \*ἀσαμός accounted for.

When our author in discussing the etymology of Ἀῖδης falls back upon the time-honoured composition of *a-* priv. with *vid-*, i.e. 'unseen' (!), he entirely overlooks the phonetic law established by Wackernagel (Kuhn's *Zeitschr.* xxvii. 276 f.). The Attic form is ᾗδης (*ā*), but ᾗδ- could yield only Attic *āδ-*; *āfīd-*, only *ηδ-*; ᾗδης must represent an original *aifīd-*, as in *ἄττω* = \**aifēttō*, cf. *ā* in *κᾶω*, *κλᾶω*, *ἀέι*. Ἀῖδης (Attic ᾗδης) may be etymologically associated as masculine patronymic (Ἀῖδος, \**Αῖς*, femin.) with *aifēi* (*ἀέι*), *αἰών*, or perhaps with *aia*, 'earth,' but certainly with some word having the diphthong *ai* in its first syllable.

The connection of κόσμος with  $\sqrt{\text{skw-}}$ , 'view,' is forced. I see no objection to deriving it from \*κόσμος (cf. τριακοστός from \*κονστός) and connecting with Lat. *censeo*.

The volume is provided with excellent indices.

BENJ. J. WHEELER.

*Ithaca.*

**Xenophon, Hellenica, Books I-IV.** Edited on the basis of Büchschütz's edition, by IRVING J. MANATT. Ginn and Co. Boston, 1888. \$1.65.

THIS book is one of a series called 'The College Series of Greek Authors' edited under the supervision of Professor White of Harvard University, and Professor Seymour of Yale University. The works of the series are all prepared on a uniform plan. A German edition is made the basis, that is, it is revised and adapted to the use intended in America. Each work contains an Introduction, the Text with Commentary on the same page, Appendices (containing brief accounts of manuscripts, editions, &c., and Critical Notes), and Indexes. Beautiful, large type is used, and the books are in every way pleasing to the eye.

The Introduction (19 pp.) to this work gives a brief account of the rise of the Athenian Empire, a sketch of the Peloponnesian War, a brief discussion of the relation of the *Hellenica* to Thucydides, the unity of the *Hellenica*, the time of composition, the chronology, the sources, and finally of Xenophon as an historian. The Introduction is satisfactory for the purpose intended, which is to familiarize the young pupil with such facts as are necessary for an intelligent study of the text. Perhaps some of the details may be questioned. It is stated, for instance, that 'the mention of the battle of Coroneia as the most important of his time suggests the inference that Xenophon wrote these words before the battles of Leuctra and Mantinea had been fought.' Rather the contrary. By implicitly ranking Coroneia above Leuctra, Xenophon may be covertly disparaging the exploits of Epaminondas in comparison with those of his great hero, Agesilaus. The characterization of Xenophon as a historian is too favourable. It may be indeed, as stated, that he never invented a positive falsehood; but to omit the most important achievements of a commander and then dwell upon insignificant matters that are not consistent with the historian's theory of strategy, is not much better. It is suggested that Epaminondas did not appear in the same brilliant light to his contemporaries as to dispassionate posterity. It is certain that he did not: but Xenophon knew that the shock of Leuctra was felt from the centre to the circumference of the Hellenic world, and he knew that it was the work of Epaminondas. The best defence attempted is that 'Xenophon, interested in the public events of his time, in some of which he took part, noted them down more perhaps for his own than for the public eye.' He would, in that case, presumably omit some of the events which it was not possible to forget; but the closing sentence of the work must then be bracketed.

The Commentary is placed, in two columns, underneath the text. (For use in the classroom a copy of the text alone is furnished with each copy of the book.) At the beginning of each chapter is a *præcis* of the matter narrated in the chapter. The Commentary also, in addition to discussing grammatical questions, explains historical allusions; so that the student obtains much historical information from a study of the book. The grammatical

comments are judicious, and parallels are cited in sufficient number. The work would, perhaps, be improved by noting the constructions and use of words peculiar to Xenophon among Attic prose authors. This might be considered premature in a work for young pupils: but it is just these that need constant warning that Xenophon's Attic is not of the purest. The practice, one might say the necessity, of beginning the study of Greek with Xenophon, generally makes it necessary for the student afterwards to unlearn a good deal. So far as was observed in perusing the book, no remark is made even on the use of *σύν*. I omit errors are few. In the note on i. 6, 7 is the remark: 'the infin. with *εἶπον* not signifying *command* is extremely rare.' This is certainly too strong. Not to mention poets or Herodotus, it is a construction used by Thucydides, Andocides, Aeschines, Demosthenes, Lycurgus, Plato (repeatedly), Aristotle. Xenophon himself has several other examples of it. This, however, is a mistake on the right side: it is well to give a warning against the promiscuous use in some of our exercise books of the infin. and of *ὑπὲρ* with the finite verb after both *εἶπον* and *φημί* (which, with rare exceptions, takes the infin.). On i. 6, 29, *Σάμιος ὀνόματι ἱππέως*, the use of *ὀνόματι* instead of *ὄνομα* or *τοῖονομα* is noted, but it is not stated why Xenophon did not say simply *ἱππέως Σάμιος*. The conjecture of Dindorf (mentioned in the Critical Notes) that this (*ὀνόματι*) is a marginal gloss, seems improbable because of the arrangement of the words. Such cases of ambiguity were sometimes avoided by analogous means. Cf. Thuc. iii. 101, 2, *εἰλον κόμην πόλιν ὄνομα ἔχουσαν*. In Hell. i. 4, 2, *ὄνομα* is, indeed, probably a gloss.—On the same paragraph is the note, 'ἐπὶ ταῖς: taken strictly this contradicts *μῆας*.' Are we to understand that because ships are drawn up in a single row, other ships cannot be placed (on the same line) *ἐν αὐταῖς*? —On iii. 1, 1 it is remarked that *Samius* is not named in the *Anabasis*, but that mention is made of the admiral Pythagoras. It might have been added that 'Pythagoras' probably grew out of *ὁ Σάμιος* by a ridiculous blunder of some old copyist.—In the note on iii. 4, 11, *τὸν αὐτοῦ οἶκον*, the fact is ignored that here *αὐτοῦ* is not simply *eius*, and that in vii. 1, 20 (cited), *οἱ ἄλλοι αὐτῶν σύμμαχοι*, the presence of the attrib. *ἄλλοι* affects the case materially. —On iv. 4, 1, *ὡς Ἀργεὺς τῆς Κορίνθου ὄρεος*, the rendering *as if Argos were Corinth* is probably inadvertent, as it is not consistent with the rest of the note. Cf. also ix. 8, 34.

The Critical Notes are designed to give an introduction to the textual criticism of the *Hellenica*. They call attention to the chief passages which have been considered doubtful, and state some of the most plausible conjectures. Original emendations by the American editor of course are not to be looked for, nor must one expect to find recognized the most recent work which is scattered about through the various journals that contain articles on Xenophon. It is not, therefore, to be wondered at that on i. 1, 35 Büchschütz's objection is repeated, that 'from Deceleia one could not possibly see ships entering the

Piraeus.' Both from *Παλαιόκαστρον* and from Katsimidhi, looking down the valley of the Cephissus one can plainly see *πλοῖα εἰς Πειραιᾶ καταθέντα*.

The work is fairly free from misprints. In the Text the worst observed are ii. 4, 16, *φν*; iii. 2, 14, *καταστήσαντες* (for *-τας*); iv. 8, 26, *τῇ Θράκη*. In the Commentary they are more numerous, but for the most part so obvious as to do no actual harm.

It is due to the author, or authors, to call attention to the facts detailed in the Preface, where we learn that, because of unavoidable circumstances, the book

was worked upon by several hands in such a way that there was want of a perfectly free exercise of judgment in making the final revision. In spite of this, the work is an attractive and useful addition to the classical apparatus of fitting-schools, and will no doubt prove of great service. Many teachers will hail it with joy as a new and fresh way to the goal usually reached by the beaten path of the *Anabasis*.

M. W. HUMPHREYS,  
*University of Virginia.*

## NOTES.

### A SUGGESTION ON AGAM. 69-71.

οὐθ' ὅποκ(λ)αίων οὐθ' ὅπολείβων  
οὐτε δακρύων ἀπύρων ἱερῶν  
ὀργὰς ἀτενεῖς παραθέλει.

In reading the *Ἀρχαιολογία Ῥωμαϊκῇ* of Dionysius of Halicarnassus I came across the following passage quoted from the Ionic writer Menecrates of Xanthus (Dionys. *Antiqq.* 1. 48). Dionysius is giving the different legends which he had found of Aeneas. After quoting the fragm. of Sophocles' *Laocoon* (Nauck 343)

νῦν δ' ἐν πύλαισιν Αἰνείας ὁ τῆς θεοῦ  
πάρεστ' ἐπ' ὧμων κ.τ.λ.

Dionysius says 'Menecrates of Xanthus states that Aeneas betrayed Troy to the Greeks from hostility to Alexander (Paris), and that for doing them this service the Greeks permitted him to preserve his family unharmed. Beginning after the burial of Achilles he has drawn up his narration in these words.

'Ἀχαιοὺς δ' ἀνίη εἶχε καὶ ἐδόκειον τῆς στρατιῆς τὴν κεφαλὴν ἀπνέχθαι, ὅμως δὲ τάφον αὐτῷ δαΐσαντες ἐπολέμεον γῇ πάσῃ (τῇ πάσῃ Reiske, βία πάσῃ Schaller), ἔχρη' Ἰάσιος ἐάλω Αἰνείεω ἐνδόντος. Αἰνείης γὰρ ἄτιτος ἔων ὑπὸ Ἀλεξάνδρου καὶ ἀπὸ γερῶν ἱερῶν ἐξεργόμενος ἀνέτρεψε Πρίαμον· ἐργασάμενος δὲ ταῦτα εἰς Ἀχαιοὺς ἐγγένοι.

Paris had put a slight upon Aeneas by excluding him from sacred privileges, and in revenge Aeneas betrayed Priam and his city to the Greeks. After this act he became a Greek himself.

Müller, who edits this fragm. with the others ascribed to Menecrates in *Fragm. Hist. Graec.* II. p. 343, says that his date is not determinable. He offers no explanation of the words *γερῶν ἱερῶν ἐξεργόμενος*. They seem naturally explicable of exclusion from some sacrificial rites which Priam and his family performed as a privilege connected with their possession of the Trojan sovereignty.

If Aeschylus knew this legend, he may have alluded to it in the passage quoted above. 'Neither by counter-offering, nor by counter-libation, nor by tears, shall Paris soothe the steadfast anger against him for sacrificial rites withheld'—not from the Gods, but from his cousin. Paris might suppose that he could deprive Aeneas of the right to sacrifice, yet make up for doing so by a compensatory sacrifice of his own.

This statement of Menecrates looks like another version of the Homeric account. In *Il.* xiii. 460 we are told that Aeneas ever bore anger against Priam, *οὐνεκ' ἄρ' ἐσθλὸν ἐόντα μετ' ἀνδράσιν οὐκί τίσκεν*. And in the xxth book Achilles taunts Aeneas (1) by telling him that Priam was not likely to make over his privilege (*γέρας* the sovereignty) to him even if he

succeeded in killing him (Achilles); (2) by asking whether the Trojans had marked off for him a special *τέμενος* or precinct as the reward of killing Achilles. It is obvious that to neither of these *γέρα* could the expression of Menecrates *γερῶν ἱερῶν ἐξεργόμενος* allude: for the latter of the two is a royal, but not in any way a specially sacred privilege; and we are bound not to trifle with the plain meaning of a prose writer. It seems a fair conclusion that the dishonour which Priam put upon Aeneas was represented in later times as an exclusion from certain sacrifices which the regal family of Troy were privileged to perform.

ROBINSON ELLIS.

\* \*

PHILEMON, in a fragment of the *Ἐφησος*, says that there are storms not only for those who sail the sea, but for those also who stay in their own houses.

χοῖ μὲν πλείοντες ἐνὶ ὄθ' ἡμέραν μίαν  
ἢ ρύκτα χειμασθέντες εἰς τὸ κακοῦ  
σωτηρίας ἐπέτυχον· ἢ τὸ πνεῦμα γὰρ  
αὐτοὺς τὸ σῶζον ἦκεν ἢ φάνη λιμὴν.  
ἐμοὶ δὲ τοῦτ' οὐκ ἔστιν· οὐκ εἰς ἡμέραν  
χειμαζόμεαι μίαν γὰρ, εἰς τὸ ζῆν δ' ὅλον,  
ἀεὶ τὸ λυπεῖσθαι δὲ μείζον γίγνεται.

so the fourth line stands emended in Meineke and in Kock's more recent collection. The MSS. seem to give *αὐτοὺς τὸ σῶζον ἢ μὲν ἐφάνη or ἡμέρα ἐφάνη*. But the repeated *τὸ* can hardly be right, and *ἦκεν*, whether from *ἔημι* or *ἔκω*, is questionable. Perhaps the poet wrote *ἢ τὸ πνεῦμα γὰρ αὐτοῖς ἴσως ἀνῆκεν ἢ φάνη λιμὴν*, 'either the wind drops or a haven comes in sight.' Compare Alexis' *Ἀπεγλαυκόμενος*, 1. 17, *ὥσπερ πυρετὸς ἀνῆκεν* and 1. 14 of his 'incerta' in Meineke: compare also the persons in Herodotus II. 113 and IV. 152 (cited in Liddell and Scott) who were carried to Egypt and beyond the Pillars of Hercules, *οὐ γὰρ ἀνίει τὰ πνεύματα*. Lines 5-6 give the antithesis to *ἀνῆκεν*.

HERBERT RICHARDS.

\* \*

HORACE, *Car.* III. 30.

Exegi monumentum aere perennius  
Regalique *situ* pyramidum altius.

The word '*situ*' is always translated 'structure,' but it is difficult to parallel this use. Perhaps it may have the meaning 'mould,' 'decay.' The line might then be rendered: 'higher than the pyramids, those mouldering relics of old kings.' This sense seems to be borne out by the following lines in which Horace says that his work will not suffer any decay or damage from the storms of heaven or of time.

H. S. MCINTOSH.



## OBITUARY.

THE LATE JOHN F. DAVIES, M.A., LIT. D., *Professor of Latin, Queen's College, Galway.*

THE name of John Fletcher Davies, who died at Galway, Jan. 3rd, 1889, will not soon be forgotten in Ireland, nor, I think, in England, where there is ever to be found the most generous appreciation of Irish scholarship, and where the most kindly feelings towards its exponents prevail. If he had lived a week or two longer, he would have been the recipient of a high and well-deserved honour. The Board of Trinity College, Dublin, had resolved to apply to the Senate for a Grace to confer on him the degree of LL.D. *honoris causa*, but alas! Death came first. He was aware, however, that the authorities of the College of which he was such a devoted son proposed to confer on him this mark of their esteem, and this, perhaps somewhat tardy, recognition of his services to learning gave him the greatest joy that the grasp of disease and approaching death allowed him to feel.

John Davies was elected to a scholarship in Trinity College, Dublin, in the year 1858, and graduated as one of the Senior Moderators in classics in 1859, the late Henry Tyrrell being first, and Prof. Mahaffy and Lord Justice Fitzgibbon being the other Senior Moderators. For some years he presided over a school in Kingstown, which under him easily surpassed all competing institutions in the excellence of its classical teaching. He afterwards came to live in College, and coached for a while; and subsequently he undertook the classical teaching in St. Gregory's College at Downside in Somersetshire. Here again his success was most marked, and much regret was mingled with the congratulations of the worthy Fathers when he was elected to the Chair of Latin in Galway in 1880, succeeding Dr. Maguire, who resigned the Professorship on becoming a Fellow of Trinity College.

I never knew a man who had so great a faculty for winning the respect, regard, and even affection of his pupils; and most certainly he did not achieve this end by concealing or excusing their shortcomings. I think the source of his influence was his absolutely sincere enthusiasm for learning, and his superiority to all pretence or simulation. His conversation was keenly stimulating, and his erudition was really remarkable. I believe he was quite as familiar

with the whole of the *Naturalis Historia* of Pliny as most scholars are with the *Annals* of Tacitus; yet he never pursued, as some do, the by-paths of literature to the neglect of the high roads. He could repeat hundreds of the most exquisite lines of the Greek Anthology by heart, but he was no less familiar with Homer and the Attic poets; and because he knew Dio Cassius better than most men he did not regard this as a reason why he should read Thucydides less.

His chief works are the *Choëphoræ*, 1862, the *Agamemnon*, 1868, and the *Eumenides*, 1885; but between the two last came many very valuable papers in *Hermathena* on Homer, Sophocles, and Cicero. He was a constant and brilliant contributor to *Kottabos*, and in *Dublin Translations* gave the editor invaluable aid. His last work was interrupted by death when about half completed. His design was to translate the Odes of Horace back into the Greek from which they were presumably taken. As the work advanced, I think he felt that he could hardly aim so high as this; but some of his versions afford striking proofs of the precise accuracy and immense range of his vocabulary—from Homer to Paulus Silentarius—and of his wonderful taste and feeling for poetry. I hope in the forthcoming *Hermathena* to attempt to make an estimate of his work, and to give specimens of his best contributions to classical learning. Here I think I cannot do better than conclude this notice with a few examples of the marvellous skill shown in the execution of the most interesting project which beguiled the long months of an illness which ended in his deeply lamented death. We can see how little power disease and approaching death had over the brightness and vigour of his intellect. I select the shorter pieces, each illustrating a different metre.

Hor. I. 38.—*Persicos odi, puer, apparatus.*

Περσικὸν, παιδίσκε, τρύφημα μισῶ.  
οὐ στέφος πλεκτὸν φίλῳ με τέρπει.  
γῆς ὕπον δηρὸν ῥόδον ὑστέρησεν  
λήγε μεταλλῶν.  
μυρσίνη λιτῇ σὺ προσεκπονίης,  
λίσσομαι, μηδέν' πρέπει οἰκίῃ σοί  
μυρσίνη κάμοι πυκινῆς ἐπ' οἴνης  
ζυροποτοῦντι.

III. 12.—Miserarum est neque amori dare ludum neque dulci.

τὸ ταλαιῶν ἄρα μηδὲν ποτ' ἐρωτὶ ξυναθίρειν  
μελικράτῳ τ' ἀποκλύζειν ἀνὴρ', εἰ δ', ἀποδρᾶναι  
φυλάκων κέντρα τὰ γλώσσης;

καλάθον μὲν σ' ἀποσυλᾷ Κυθερείας περὶοῖς  
παῖς,

σέ τ' Ἀθηναῖς μελετῆς, στημόνος ἔργου, Νεο-  
βούλη,

Λιπαραίων σέλας Ἐβρου,

Τιβερυνοῖς ὑπὸ τ' ὤμων λιπαροῦς κύμασι λούει,  
καλὸς ἵππεὺς παρὰ καὶ Βελλεροφόντην, ποσσὶ  
νωθροῖς

ὄγε πυγμαῖς τ' ἀπρόσικτος

ἰδρὶς αὐτὸς προφυγούσας θορυβιόδει δι' ἀπόπτων  
ἀγέλη δορκάδας αἰρεῖν πυκνῇ δ' ὄξυν ἐν ἔλῃ  
σὺ κρυπτῷ προὔπαντάν.

III. 26.—Vixi puellis nuper idoneus.

ἀρμὸι συνέζων ἰσοπαλὲς κόραις,

ἀνδρὲ στρατεῖαν ἤγον ἀνευ κλέους,

νῦν ὅπλα κἀγῶνων λυθέντα

βάρβριτον οἴτος ὁ τοῖχος ἔξει

λαῖος φυλάσσω Κύπριδα ποντίαν.

ὦδ' ὦδε λαμπρὰς δαῖδας ἀφίετε,

καὶ τόξα καὶ μύχλους θύραισιν

ἀντικαθισταμέναις ἀπειλάς.

ὦ πότνα, ναίεις ἢ Κύπρον ὀλβίαν

καὶ Μέμφιν εὖναι Σιβονίου πάγον,

ὥνασσ', ἅπαξ ἄρδην μαράγγην

νύσσε Χλόην ὑπερρηφανούσαν.

IV. 10.—O crudelis adhuc et Veneris mun-  
neribus potens.

ὦ νήλης ἔτι καὶ νῦν, Κύπριδος δ' ὀλβιε δωρεαῖς,  
δυστερπῆς ἐπὶ σαῖς ἀγλαῖαις εὔτε μολῇ χνός,  
χὺς νῦν ἀμφιποταῖται πλόκαμος νῶτα χάμαι πέσῃ,  
φοινικοῦ τε βόδον σὸν καλῦκων ἄνθος ὑπέρτερον  
μαυροθὼν Λεγυρίνον ῥέθος ἐς τραχὺ μεταπλάσῃ,  
φθέγγει, φεῦ, σε κατόπτρῳ προσιδὼν πάνθ' ἔτερον  
σέθεν,

τίφθ' ὅς σήμερόν ἐστ' οὐχὶ πάρος παιδὶ νόος  
παρῆν;

εἰ δ' οὖν, τίπτε φρεσὶν ταῖσδ' ἀσινεῖς οὐχὶ  
παρηίδες;

I would gladly add here more of these specimens of Professor Davies' learning and skill. But I hope to have an opportunity of publishing all his translations of the Odes of Horace—they are fifty-four in number—in a little volume; or, if this should seem undesirable, I would offer them from time to time to the readers of the *Classical Review*, *Hermathena*, and *Kottabos*. Perhaps however the above extracts will be enough for an age which is gradually growing more and more indifferent to the more spiritual side of classics, if I may so speak; or perhaps I should rather say, to the less solid achievements of scholarship.

R. Y. TYRRELL.

THE REV. CHURCHILL BABINGTON, D.D., F.L.S., &c.

BORN MARCH 11, 1821, DIED JANUARY 12, 1889.

In Churchill Babington, as in F. A. Paley, Cambridge has lost a son in whom classical learning was combined with a great variety of other tastes and accomplishments. Born and bred in rural Leicestershire, where the Babington family had for more than 300 years owned the manor of Rothley, he imbibed a love of country sports and interests which remained with him through life. Besides fishing and shooting he delighted in making collections in natural history, and thus qualified himself to write the sections on botany and ornithology for Potter's well-known *History of Charnwood Forest* while he was still an undergraduate. In later years he contributed largely to Sir W. Hooker's *Journal of Botany*, and wrote the section on Lichens in Hooker's *Flora of New Zealand*. In 1886 he brought out a very complete work on the birds of Suffolk. He was also an excellent conchologist. His literary and antiquarian tastes were an inheritance from

his father, the Rector of Thringston, Leicestershire, by whom he was educated till the end of his seventeenth year, and who had himself made considerable preparations for an edition of Horace. In 1839 Churchill was entered at St. John's College, Cambridge, having been for the preceding year under the tuition of the distinguished orientalist and archaeologist, Charles Wycliffe Goodwin, the brother of the present Bishop of Carlisle. In the Tripos lists of 1843 he was Senior Optime in mathematics, and seventh in the first class of the Classical Tripos. Soon afterwards he was elected a Fellow of his College. In 1845 he won the Hulsean prize for an essay on 'The influence of Christianity in promoting the abolition of slavery in Europe.' In 1848 he brought out his criticism on 'Macaulay's character of the Clergy in the Seventeenth Century,' to which he subsequently made large MS. additions. In 1855 he edited the extremely scarce work

entitled *Beneficio di Christo*, which was then generally ascribed to Paleario, together with the contemporary English and French translations. He further edited the first two volumes of Higden's *Polychronicon*, with two English versions (a work completed by Dr. Lumby), and Pecoek's early English *Repressor*, for the Master of the Rolls. As a scholar his most important work was the publication of four speeches of Hyperides from the very ancient papyri discovered at the Egyptian Thebes and purchased by Messrs. Harris & Arden in 1847, and by Mr. Stobart in 1856. (See for an account of these papyri, now in the British Museum, Mr. E. M. Thompson in the first volume of this *Review*, p. 39). He catalogued the classical MSS. belonging to the Cambridge University Library, and contributed several important articles to the *Dictionary of Christian Antiquities*, besides numerous papers to the *Numismatic Chronicle* and the *Cambridge Journal of Classical and Sacred Philology*. In 1865 he was elected Disney Professor of Archaeology, a post which he held for fifteen years, illustrating his lectures from his own very fine collection of ancient coins and vases. The Fitzwilliam Museum is indebted to him for many valuable gifts, as well as for the arrangement and cataloguing of its collections.

One word in conclusion as to the man himself, as he appeared to those who knew him personally. The leading feature of his character in their eyes was an antique simplicity, that beautiful εὐθεία, of which, Thucydides tells us, τὸ γενναῖον πλείστον μετέχει. Never was any man more thoroughly kind-hearted, more natural, more genial. Never did any one work more conscientiously, whether as writer, as lecturer, or as parish priest, first at Horningsea, from 1848 to 1861, and afterwards at Cockfield, from 1866 to his death.

NOTE ON BABINGTON'S HYPERIDES BY DR. SANDYS.

Babington's reputation as a Greek scholar rests on his editions of the speeches of Hyperides discovered in

Egypt in 1847 and 1856. When part of the fragments found in the former year had been identified by others as belonging to an oration against Demosthenes in the affair of Harpalus, he was the first in England to prove conclusively, from Harpocration, Photius and Suidas, that they belonged to the oration actually delivered by Hyperides. This he did in a paper read before the Royal Society of Literature in November, 1849. In the following year he brought out his edition of the speech, having undertaken and completed it without being aware that the text of the fragments published in facsimile in England in the autumn of 1848 had been printed in German periodicals by Boeckh and Sauppe before the close of the year. His own edition is thus a perfectly independent piece of work, including a preliminary dissertation and notes, as well as a facsimile of a portion of the MS., while the text itself is reproduced (and, so far as practicable, restored) with the most scrupulous accuracy. In the editor's own words, 'wherever a letter is legible it will be found.' In 1853 he published, with an excellent facsimile, the *editio princeps* of the speeches for Lycophron and Euxenippus, with a recension of the text, notes and preliminary dissertations. Schneidewin, the next editor of the same speeches, pays the following well-deserved tribute to his predecessor's labours: 'Qui se his reliquiis editorem obtulit vir reverendus, Churchill Babington, munus suum summa cum fide executus est. Sollerter ductus litterarum enucleavit, lacera reconcinnavit, corrupta restituit . . . Idem præter luculentum proemium addidit annotationes patrio sermone conceptas, in quibus multa docte illustravit indicioue, si a paucis locis discesseris, usus est recto et sano . . . Multum præstitit Babington et quæ ab editore principe postulari vel ab iniquis censoribus possint. Messem fecit ille, spicas legere reliquit aliis.' Babington himself shows a similar generosity in briefly commending a subsequent edition of the *pro Euxenippo* by Linder as 'on the whole the best edition of the text that has yet appeared' (*Journal of Cl. and S. Philology*, iv 106). In 1858 he produced the *editio princeps* of the Funeral Oration of Hyperides, including a facsimile of the whole of the papyrus, which was followed by a smaller edition in 1859. His edition of the Funeral Oration was marked by the same accuracy, and the same acumen, as his earlier work. Perhaps the weightiest testimony on this point is that of Sauppe, the joint editor of all the Attic Orators, who (in contrast to Kayser) 'hanc Babingtoni operam minime levem fuisse ostendit laudata editoris principis perspicacitate' (Fritzsche, *De Hyperidis laudatione funebri*, p. 3). As to the generally high merit of his work on Hyperides, all who have any intimate knowledge of it will agree in the tribute paid him by Blass, the only other scholar who has traversed the whole of the same ground as an editor, when he enlogises him as 'vir de Hyperide imprimis optime meritus.'—J. E. S.

## ARCHAEOLOGY.

*Handbuch der Klassischen Altertums-Wissenschaft*, Edited by Dr. IWAN MÜLLER; Nördlingen, 1888, pp. 690—920.

THIS part of Dr. Müller's excellent *Classical Handbook* consists mainly of a sort of abstract from various German writings on

the topography of Rome drawn up by Dr. Otto Richter of Berlin.

A great deal of valuable information is given within a very narrow compass, and the matter is well arranged so as to facilitate reference.

On the other hand one cannot help re-

marking that this essay, like many other recent German productions, suffers seriously from its author's neglect of all that has been written on the subject by any English author. It is becoming far too common for the younger German writers to ignore the literature of all other countries than their own. Many of Dr. Richter's blunders might have been avoided if he had made himself acquainted with what has been written on the subject of Roman archaeology in this country.

Thus, for example, he repeats the old error of calling the small shrine between the temples of Concord and Vespasian in the Forum, the Aedicula of Faustina, though it has been clearly shown from indisputable constructional evidence that this little shrine was built at the same time as the adjoining temple of Vespasian; that is during the reign of Domitian.

Though apparently well read in the various Classical authors who deal with the subject, Dr. Richter very frequently fails to understand the still clearer evidence which is given by the existing remains of Ancient Rome, and hence some of his conclusions are very wide of the true mark. The fact is that it is very rare to find united in one man that combination of scholarship and practical knowledge of the details of construction which are necessary to enable an archaeologist to deal really successfully with ancient buildings;—such a combination in fact as is to be found in the person of Dr. Dörpfeld, whose services to this science have been so brilliant in Sicily and Greece.

The large plan of the Roman Forum, published in this Handbook by Dr. Richter, is a copy of that made by Prof. Middleton, and printed in his *Ancient Rome*. In his text on the subject no mention of this fact is made by Dr. Richter: a note in microscopic type in another place is the only pretence of acknowledgment.

An elaborate plan of this sort, showing the different dates and materials of a large number of buildings, is so laborious a work, and so important a part of the description of a place like the Roman Forum, that its use by another writer without proper acknowledgment of its authorship is really a more serious matter than even the copying of many pages of text.

#### INSCRIPTIONS FROM THYATIRA.

THE following are among a number of inscriptions chiefly copied from marbles in

or near Ak-Hissar, the ancient Thyatira, by M. Matteo Scicluna, engineer to the Turkish Government for the Vilayet of Aidin (who resides at Smyrna), and forwarded through Mr. Dennis, H. M. Consul General at Smyrna, to the British Museum. Upon examination of M. Scicluna's transcripts, I found many of the inscriptions had been published already, partly in the *Corpus Inscriptionum Graecarum* (e.g. No. 3509), and others by M. Michel Clerc in the *Bulletin de Correspondance Hellénique*, 1886, pp. 398 foll. (*Inscriptions de Thyatire et ses environs*), and by M. Radet, *Inscriptions de Lydie*, pp. 445 foll. of vol. xi. of the *Bulletin* (1887).

I am not aware, however, that those which are printed here have ever been published. The text is based, not upon paper impressions, but upon M. Scicluna's manuscript.

The following are from Ak-Hissar, or Thyatira.

#### 1.

Broken to right, and below.

'Ak-Hissar.'

. . . . νος Τίμωνος Θυα[τερι-  
ν]ός οἰκοδόμησεν τὸν [βωμ-  
ὸν] καὶ συστρώσας τὰς κα[μά-  
ρ]α(ς) πυλαίδια ἐπέθηκεν [καὶ  
5. τὴν] σορὸν ἐπέθηκε κα . . .  
. . . οὐ τοίχου ἐαυτῷ καὶ π[αι-  
δο]ῖς καὶ γυναικὶ αὐ[τοῦ] . .  
. . . ληπέην κα[ὶ] . . .

For πυλαίδια, i.e. πυλῖδα, a kind of coffin, compare *C.I.G.* 3517 (from Thyatira) and other examples cited in the Index to the *Corpus*, s. vv. πυλῖς, πύελος.

#### 2.

'Ak-Hissar.'

ΣΕΜΙΡΑΜΙΣ  
ΠΕΛΩΠΙΑ  
ΘΥΑΤΕΙΡΑ

#### 3.

'Ak-Hissar.'

[Ἡ δέῖνα]  
[τὸν δέῖνα] Διοφάντου τὸν  
ἐαυτῆς] ἀνδ[ρα] [ἐκ τῶν  
ἰδίων.

#### 4.

'Ak-Hissar.'

Ἀπολ[λωνία] Ἀπολ[λ-  
ων]ῶν θυγά[τηρ] . . .



δε]ὰ βίον κο ... κατασκ-  
εύ]ασεν . . . .  
— . . τ — . .

5.

‘Ak-Hissar.’

Ἀγαθῇ [τύχῃ]  
Οἱ] περὶ τὸ [ν δέϊνα  
τ]ῶν πρώτῳ ν γυμνα-  
[σίῳν κ.τ.λ.]

Compare *C.I.G.* No. 3503.

6.

‘Ak-Hissar.’

ΤΟΡΙΑ  
ΑΔΜΑΝΙ  
ΟΛΥΜΙ  
ᾠΤΝΙ

Possibly somewhat thus :

Αὐτοκρά]τορι [Κ]α[ί-  
σαρι] Ἀδ[ρι]αν[ῶ]  
Ὀλυμ[πίῳ] κ.τ.λ.

7.

‘Ak-Hissar.’

MARMORE  
STRAVIT  
SALVRNOS

The last line must be copied inaccurately.

The following are marked as coming from  
‘Milas, au Sandjak de Mentché (Monghla)’.  
Concerning Monghla see MM. Georges  
Cousin and Gaston Deschamps in the *Bulle-  
tin de Correspondance Hellénique*, x. 1886, pp.  
485. foll.

8.

‘Milas.’

Ἀρτεμεισία Πα . . . ἰλου.

9.

‘Milas.’

[Ἡ δέϊνα]

ἱέρηα Νεμέσεως μετὰ  
κυρίου τοῦ ἀνδρός  
Μένιππου τοῦ Μέ(λ)ανος  
ἱερέως Πειθοῦς ἀνέθηκεν  
τό τε βῆμα  
καὶ τὸ ἀγαλμα καὶ τὰ σὺν αὐτῷ  
Νεμέσει καὶ τῷ δήμῳ.

The letters appear to belong to the first  
century A.D. : with this would agree the form  
ἱέρηα for ἱέρεια. Observe that the wife could  
not by Greek law make a public gift without  
her husband's consent : he is her κύριος (see  
Lewy, *De civili condicione mulierum grae-  
carum*, 1885, pp. 18, 21).

10.

‘Milas.’

Ὁ δῆμος  
Αὐτοκράτορα Τιβε-  
ριον Καίσαρα Θεοῦ  
υἱὸν Σεβαστόν.

11.

‘Milas.’

[Ὁ δέϊνα τὸν δέϊνα]  
τὸν ἑαυτοῦ  
εὐεργέτην.

12.

‘Milas.’

ΙΟΥ ΤΟΠΟΡΟΣ  
ΙΟΝ ΚΑΙΤΟΥ

13.

‘In the Turkish cemetery (?) near the  
carriage way in Axare.’

ΠΑΡΔΑΛΑΣ

Παρδάλας.

A man's name.

14.

‘Street Sichissa in the house of Madame  
Magnessalia, in Axare.’

Αἰρ. Πολύθαλλο[ς]  
Μηροφιλανοῦ  
Φρόντωνος Πο-  
(λ)υθάλλον, ὁ ἀγωνο-  
θέτης τοῦ προπά-  
τορος θεοῦ Ἥλι-  
ου Πυθίου Ἀπόλλω-  
νος Τ(ν)ριμναίου,  
Αἰρ . . .

The worship of Apollo Tyrinnius is well  
known from other inscriptions from Thy-  
atira and a festival (θυμεικὸς καὶ γυμνικὸς  
ἀγών) was held in his honour : Compare *C. I.  
G.* 3493, 3500 ; *Bulletin de Correspondance  
Hellénique* (1886, p. 421). XI (1887), p.  
453.

## 15.

'In the house of M. Vassili Anagnosti, in Yiayiakiōi: inscribed round the body of a jar.'

Τύχη ἀγαθῇ  
Ἡ κρατίστη βουλή καὶ ὁ δια-  
ση(μ)ότατος δῆμος Γλύκιν-  
ναν Ἀπολλωνίου μητέρα  
5 Αἰλιανού ἥρωος, διὰ τὰς τοῦ  
ἀνδρὸς αὐτῆς Ποπλίου Αἰλίου  
Αἰλιανού εἰς τὴν πατρίδα  
φιλοτειμίας.

## 16.

'Inscription unearthed in May, 1887, among some ruins at the foot of the cliffs of Sipylus some furlongs beyond the so-called Niobe': (G. Dennis).

Ἡ βουλή καὶ ὁ δῆμος  
ἐτείμῃσαν Ἀπολ-  
λώνιον τοῦ  
Ἀλεξάνδρου Σκυ-  
5 τάλαν φιλοτειμίας  
καὶ μεγαλοψύχως  
πάντα παρσχόντα  
τῇ ἐαυτοῦ πατρίδι,  
ἐξαίρετως δὲ ἐπεὶ  
10 καὶ τὸν ναὸν ἐκ τῶν  
ιδίων κατασκευάσας  
ἐκ βυθῶν σὺν τῷ παν-  
τὶ κόσμῳ τῇ θεῷ  
καθεύερωσεν  
πάν τὸ [ἰδεθ'] λον.

## 17.

'Village Gapadji (là près): Église trouvée près de Bobou.' The drawing sent with the transcript exhibits a handsome stelè of regular proportions, and in complete preservation; height 0, 87-5; width 0, 37-5. The upper part of the surface is adorned with a chaplet of ivy, neatly cut, surmounted by a rosette; to right of chaplet a curved staff or crook.

\*Ετους σνδ· μη(νός) Δα[ι-  
σίον εν' Ἀλκαῖος  
Πειλᾶ Νήφοντι νέω  
χρηστῷ συντρο-  
φῷ μνείας χάριν.

I suppose Πειλᾶ to be the genitive of Πειλᾶς contracted for Πείλατος, though it is nowhere found.

## 18.

This marble was found at Ghédiz in the Vilayet of Kutaya; it is now at Koulah, in

a private house. It is an ornamental stelè, surmounted by a rosette at the apex: height, 0, 60: width 0, 42.

\*Ετους ρφζ (= A.D. 113) μη(νός) Ξανδικού

*Bird in relief*

Cyrus for books (?)	τε	σσ-
	αρ	εσ-
	κα	ιδ-
	εκ	άτη-
Open book ?		
a rod or staff (?)		

Τρόφιμος Γαίω  
καὶ Ἐλπίδι θρέ(ψ)ασι  
γλ(υ)κντάτος μνίας  
χάριν

The copy reads ΘΡΕΥΑCΙ, which should be θρέψασι: Trophimos erects this monument to his foster-parents. The day of the month, τεσσαρεσκαίδεκάτη, is to be construed after Ξανδικού.

## 19.

'This stone was brought from Simav, and is now at the Conak of Koulah.'

ΓΑΛΛΙΚΩΑΣΚΛΗΠΙΑΣ  
ΚΩΜΗΕΡΥΖΩΝΠΑΙ  
ΔΙΣΧΗ· ΔΙΟΓΕΝΟΥ  
ΛΥΤΡΟΝ

I am at a loss how to decipher it.

## 20.

'This inscription is at the Bazar (Londja) at Koulah.'

Τιβερῖον Κλαν-  
δίου Μάχτων (sic)  
καὶ Φλαβίας  
Ἀπφίας. Ζῆ.

Perhaps we should restore Μα(ύρ)ον in line 2.

## 21.

Brought from Simav, and now at Koulah.'

Μηνόφιλος κ(αί) Εὔτακτος κ(αί) Ἀσκλη[ς] κ(αί)  
Τειμοκράτης οἱ ἀδελφοὶ σὺν τῇ  
μητρὶ Ἀμμῖω ἐτείμῃσαν Τε-  
λίσφορον τὸν πατέρα μνήρα(ς)  
χάριν.

E. L. HICKS.

## THEANGELA.

THE site of the ancient Carian town of Souagela, which in its Greek form was called Theangela, has long been a matter of uncertainty. Sir C. Newton had conjectured Theangela to be the modern Assarlik: Mr. Paton, on the other hand, who excavated at Assarlik (*Hellenic Journal* VIII. p. 64), considered that this site represents the ancient Termera, and proposed to identify Theangela with 'an ancient necropolis now known as Tchoukchalar-Kale, immediately above Budrum (to the north), almost on the narrowest part of the peninsula.'

Further researches, made during the past few months in the neighbourhood, have now enabled Mr. Paton to obtain decisive evidence which settles the question. In the *Mittheilungen* XII., p. 335, Judeich describes a site called Kenier, where certain statues and inscriptions had recently been discovered in excavations by a native of the place, which Judeich proposed to identify with the ancient town of Pedasa. The inscriptions have disappeared: some of them seem to have been forwarded to Paris, and are believed to be now in the possession of Dr. Fröhner. Two of them, which may or may not be in Dr. Fröhner's collection, were copied on the spot, and these copies were seen by Mr. Paton in November last, who wrote at the time to me that 'they establish beyond doubt that the site (Kenier) described by Judeich is Theangela. One is a letter from some one to the Θεαγγελαίς which should prove interesting: the other is a decree in honour of a citizen of Theangela which is to be engraved on two stelae, one to be set up in the temple of Apollo Thearios, the other in Theangela in the temple of Athene.'

Meanwhile the identification thus arrived at by Mr. Paton's investigations had been confirmed from another source. In the autumn of 1888 Mr. Theodore Bent forwarded to Mr. Hicks copies of three inscriptions which an agent had transcribed from 'certain marbles that had been found with other antiquities on a site in the Gulf of Kos.' This site was clearly the site mentioned by Judeich, and Mr. Hicks prepared and forwarded to the *Classical Review* an excellent article on these three inscriptions, of which he says 'the copies seem fairly accurate, and are practically sufficient.' The first is the decree before mentioned, in honour of one Aristides, son of Neon, of Theangela, and states where the two stelae are to be set up: the honour is granted by the senate and people of Troezen, and five envoys are ap-

pointed to convey the decree to Theangela. 'The extreme rarity of documents from Troezen,' Mr. Hicks remarks, 'adds a further interest to this fragment. For the temple of Apollo Thearios at Troezen, see Pausanias, ii. 31 § 9.'

The second inscription refers to certain political events which found the citizens divided among two contending parties: it records the peaceful settlement of the conflict, and gives the concluding formulae of the oath to be taken by members of the defeated party upon being readmitted to the city and its franchise: with the usual imprecations on those who transgress the oath.

The third inscription is the concluding part of a decree granting honours to a benefactor of the city, in the usual formula. 'The only variation is in the gift of two jars of honey by way of ξένα. The recipient of these honours had them voted in his absence; had he been present the ξένα would have consisted of an invitation to the *πρωτανείον*.'

The complete publication of Mr. Hicks' paper has been deferred, on the understanding that Dr. Fröhner may possibly have the original marbles of some or all of these inscriptions, and in that case will himself publish them. It is however only fair to the independent investigations of Messrs. Paton, Bent and Hicks that the result of their labours should be published without loss of time.

I may add that there is in the British Museum an archaic marble torso which represents a draped female figure holding a dove on her breast, which is almost certainly one of those mentioned by Judeich, *loc. cit.*; the base of one of them is figured, *ibid.* p. 337. The type corresponds, and the man from whom it was procured (at Syme) stated that it came from the coast of Caria. This man was the individual who made the excavations to which Judeich refers. This torso is mentioned by Furtwängler in the *Phil. Wochens.* 1888, p. 1516, as coming from Samos: he has evidently mistaken Samos for Syme. I give below Mr. Hicks' note on the history and importance of Theangela.

CECIL SMITH.

THE unpublished inscriptions referred to above, fragmentary as they are, yet reveal that Theangela was a town of some standing, probably of some strategical importance, in the third century B.C. All that is known of the town and its history has been admirably summed up by Waddington-Le Bas (*Voyage Archéologique*, No. 599 a, b, wherein a Μενεκράτης Λεωνίδου Θεαγγ[ελαίς]

is named as a proxenos of Tralles), and by Böckh-Fränkel, *Staatsh.* ii. p. 485. It may be convenient however to place the *loci classici* before the reader.

Σαγγελῆς are mentioned in the Attic Tribute lists of the fifth century, as assessed at one talent (*C. I. A.* vol. i.).

In the list of proxeni at Tralles cited already, the name is written Θαναγγεῖς: the identity of the two is allowed by all scholars. Another, perhaps later, spelling, as in our document, was Θεαγγεῖς. Steph. Byz. gives two forms of the name: *s.v.* Σανάγελα· πόλις Καρίας, ἐνθα ὁ τάφος ἦν τοῦ Καρός, ὡς δηλοῖ καὶ τοῖνομα. καλοῦσι γὰρ οἱ Κάρες σοῦαν τὸν τάφον, γέλαν δὲ τὸν βασιλέα. ὁ πολίτης Σαναγγεῖς. And again, *s.v.* Θεάγγελα· πόλις Καρίας. ὁ πολίτης Θεαγγεῖς.

Athenaeus (vi. 271 b) quotes the historian Philip of Theangela: Φίλιππος ὁ Θεαγγελεὺς ἐν τῷ περὶ Καρῶν καὶ Δελέγων συγγράμματι: from this work probably much of the information about Caria in Strabo, and perhaps in Stephanus, was derived. Pliny (*N. H.* v. 107) says that Theangela was assigned to Halicarnassus by Alexander the Great (Halicarnassus: sex oppida contributa ei sunt a Magno Alexandro, Theangela, Side, Medmassa, Uranium, Pedasum, Telmisum). Here Pliny has made an obvious mistake of memory. It was not Alexander but Mausolus who interfered with the towns of the Leleges, as Strabo tells us (xiii. 611): φασὶ δ' ἐν αὐτῇ [sc. τῇ Πηδασίδι χώρῃ] καὶ ὀκτὼ πόλεις ὥκισθαι ἐπὶ τῶν Δελέγων πρότερον εὐανδρησάντων . . . τῶν δ' ὀκτὼ πόλιν τὰς ἐξ Μαύσωλος εἰς μίαν τὴν Ἀλικαρνασσὸν συνήγαγεν, ὡς Καλλιस्थένης ἱστορεῖ· Σανάγγελα δὲ καὶ Μύνδον διεφύλαξε.

In a list of Athenian mercenary soldiers (*C. I. A.* ii. No. 963) which dates from about 300 B.C. or a little later, we find the names of five men of Theangela—Θεαγγεῖς, Ἐρμογένης, Φανίας, Μελάνθιος, Ἡρακλείδης, Ἀρτεμίδωρος.

To this town, or to Syme, numismatists are inclined to attribute an Attic drachm of the fourth century with the letters ΣΥ (Head, *Historia Numorum*, p. 542).

E. L. HICKS.

#### ACQUISITIONS OF BRITISH MUSEUM.

A sard intaglio representing Aphrodite seated on a rock. This gem was found in Greece and is a good specimen of gem-engraving in the third century, B.C.

Bronze vessel found in the Bintron mine, province of Huelva, south Spain: on the handle is the stamp of the Coccei—COCCEIURUM (*Archaeologia* xliii. pl. 33, p. 558.).

CECIL SMITH.

ATHENS.—The work of excavating on the Akropolis is at length coming to an end; there remains only a small space on the north side of the Parthenon to be cleared, and the arrangement of the Braurion precinct, together with a few undertakings of minor importance.

The most recent discoveries have more than kept up the high level of interest which has marked the undertaking throughout. First in importance comes a marble fragment which supplies an important lacuna in one of the most beautiful slabs of the Parthenon frieze; this fragment, which was found in the work of arrangement on the so-called 'Ergane terrace,' has been recognised by Dr. Waldstein as forming part of the slab with Zeus, Hera, and Nike from the east frieze; it gives the head of Nike, in good preservation, and the upper part of her right wing, with the left hand grasping the hair. I understand that a cast of this new fragment is now on its way to England. On the same terrace has been found at a great depth a bronze disk, 90 cm. in circumference, which is fitted with an attachment in the middle of the back; on the front is a large figure of Medusa, of a most archaic type, with a square head of the horrible type, thin figure, and a long robe reaching to the ankles; this relief is of very rudimentary technique, in hammered bronze; the eyelids are chiselled, the pupils of the eyes punched out. The find is of great interest in view of the rarity of specimens of the earliest Athenian bronze work which have come down to us. This 'Ergane terrace' is not (as Ulrichs merely conjectured) an Ergane temple, but is the Chalkotheke, which was formerly thought to lie against the north wall near the Propylaea, and which has now been identified as such by Dörpfeld.

Two more archaic heads have come to light, and a stele with an inscription which includes the name of the early artist Endoios.

As the work of sorting and arrangement progresses, many fresh discoveries are being made; in the room of the Akropolis Museum are now set up the two groups of poros stone rather over life size, which seem to have formed portions of pedimental sculptures. The one is a figure of Typhon with three bodies; the other a group of Herakles and Triton; both have strongly marked traces of colour. There is also a group of a bull, in the style of the Assos sculptures, which has fallen to the ground, attacked by two lions with gryphons' claws. Of the architectural fragments, the most interesting are the fragments of columns which have flutings not parallel to the axis, but arranged in spirals around the drum (*Phil. Wochensch.*).

In the excavations carried out under the direction of the Inspector General of Antiquities has been found in a wall now in course of demolition near the Propylaea an inscription which records part of the expense incurred in the purchase of the ivory and gold used in the execution of the chryselephantine statue of Athene by Pheidias. (Παλ. γγ. Jan. 17; "Νρ, Jan. 18).

CYPRUS.—The *Phil. Wochensch.* Jan. 10, speaks of the discovery on Nov. 16, 1888 of some antiquities at Idalion: in the shrine of Aphrodite were found a group of Aphrodite on a throne, with two children; the footstool of this group is painted with a Phoenician inscription in black. Also of four richly decorated capitals, a fragment of a column, and of a colossal sphinx; all these are of sandstone, and date from the sixth century or earlier: excepting the group, which is possibly of later date. It is not stated by whom this discovery has been made, but the notice remarks that the objects will form a rich addition to the Cyprus Museum. Meantime we hear nothing of



the much talked of Cyprus excavations which Mr. Ernest Gardner is reported to be again contemplating. But we do learn (from the *Times* of Feb. 22) that a German excavation of Idalion is set on foot. What is the use of our having a so-called British School at Athens, with a Director who is supposed to be in Cyprus, if the one sphere in which he might possibly prove his utility is thus neglected? But that question may well be asked.

DELPHI.—If ever the time comes for Delphi to be really excavated (which, in view of recent events, seems as far off as ever), the history of the abortive negotiations connected with this question will hardly read as a creditable chapter in the relations of the Greek nation to art and archaeology. The task is one of which the importance would be quite obvious enough, even if we had not before us the results already obtained in the preliminary work done by the French on this site, in which, of inscriptions alone, upwards of two hundred and fifty were discovered. The difficulties, it is fully recognised, are enormous: first of all there is the configuration of the ground. Kastri stands on a curved rocky slope, formed, as Strabo said, like a theatre: *περὶ ὅδους χαλκόν, θεατροειδές*. On this inclined plain, terraces are artificially constructed, forming as it were the seats of the theatre, echeloned into each other: on these terraces stood the houses and monuments of Delphi, and on one of the upper terraces was the temple, the area of which rested on a sort of podium formed by three walls of polygonal masonry. It is clear that the labour of operations and of shifting huge blocks of stone upon a hill side of this character will be enormous. Then there is further this difficulty, that the entire site is thickly built over with modern houses, many of them not merely hovels, but fair-sized villas. If Delphi is to be excavated, every one of these buildings will have to be bought, to the number of about 250, or, with sheds &c., of 325. So that the Greeks themselves might well be excused if they preferred for the present reserving their funds for the building of the museums so much needed for the large stores of antiquities which crowd in upon them. The excavation however is greatly needed; M. Pomtow, who has just published a work which brings our knowledge of Delphi up to date, says: 'It is incredible with what barbarity the ancient remains are treated by the Kastriotes, young as well as old: they are exposed to all sorts of destruction, and are scratched, broken, and stolen. The Ephoros, a well-meaning person, can hardly, owing to the difficulties of the position, do more than watch over what is under his charge in the museum.'

Under the circumstances then, one would suppose that the offer of a foreign school of archaeologists to carry out this excavation would be gladly accepted—especially as this offer was based on the same terms as those of the German excavations at Olympia: *i.e.* the Greeks to have everything, the diggers merely the rights of publication and of taking casts.

The scheme has always been looked upon as a settled thing for the French: indeed, more than a year ago the matter was practically settled with them upon these terms. After a vast deal of negotiating, the French plan seems to have fallen through: rumour says that the Greeks required as the price of their favours certain tariff privileges in the importation of currants into France. However this may be, a telegram to the *Times* of Feb. 12 announced that the excavation was to be undertaken by the Americans, who had settled to pay for this privilege the sum of 80,000 dollars. Then came the statement that the Greek Government had granted, or was going to grant, a sum of four million drachmae from a new

loan: and now we hear (*Standard*, Feb. 18) that the Greek Archaeological Society has declined the offer of the Americans, but that 'the hope is expressed that the Society will carry out the excavations unassisted.' Will it?

HELIKON.—At the foot of the mountain a theatre has been found, which is undoubtedly the theatre of the Muses. It is close by the Temple of the Muses, and from its site the spectators must have had a magnificent view over all Boeotia. According to the present idea of its dimensions, it seems to be of similar size to the theatre at Epidauros, which is one of the largest in Greece (*Phil. Wochensh.* Jan. 19).

CECIL SMITH.

*Bullettino della Commissione Archeologica Comunale di Roma.* 1888. Rome.

Parts IX. X. 1. Ghirardini: the statue of an ephēbus found on the Esquiline in 1874 is that of a charioteer mounting his chariot, exactly as shown in a vase painting by Pamphaios: compares it with the 'Apollo of the Omphalos' and with Pasitelian types, especially with the heads of the statues of Stefano and the Museo Chiaramonti: the original was probably in bronze of the fifth century: this is a copy of the Pasitelian school, which modernised ancient types; two double plates. 2. Cantarelli: the word *anabolicarii*, of which the meaning has been much disputed, is explained by an inscription (*C.I.L.* XII. 354): it is applied to the makers and perhaps the sellers of certain surgical instruments, 'anabolia.' 3. Tomassetti: building work in Rome in relation to archaeology and art: the house of the Pichi family. 4. Gatti: discoveries topographical and epigraphical: including an interesting epitaph of a man who was both architectus and faber navalis. C. S.

*Römische Mittheilungen.* 1888. Part 1. Rome.

1. Barnabei: inscriptions from Hadria in Picenum: from the evidence of two of these, the existence is proved of a great temple of Jove on Monte Giove: in another inscription, the mention of Q. Fabius Maximus Paulus as patronus coloniae settles the foundation of the colony as B.C. 11. 2. Mau: the basilica of Pompeii is the earliest known, being of the time when Pompeii was subject to Greek influences: it is not of the normal two storied Vitruvian type, but has the tall columns of the central nave rising to the roof, with a portico of equal height and certainly windows which lighted the interior: (Lange believed that the roof of the central nave rose above the porticos). A double row of Ionic columns is engaged in the interior of the walls: the central columns are Corinthian. The tribunal is raised 1.65 met. and has a frontage of six columns. A flight of steps leads direct into the inner portico through a vestibule: the portico is in two stories, the lower of which is formed by a row of four Ionic columns supporting a wall. 3. Wolters: the chalcidicum of the above basilica has (contrary to Mazois' restoration) five doors in the front wall, which open between six piers of tufa blocks of which the two central ones are the smallest. 4. Rossbach: publishes the drawing of the Sikanos pinax of which the original is lost: Sikanos was an Attic artist, and his style bears reminiscences of the b.f. technique: plate. 5. Hartwig: statue of Nereid on hippocamp in Vatican: the base represents waves in which are a polyp and another fish: she is attended by Eros, as on a coin of Bruttium. The sculpture is Greek, of period between Hellenic and Hellenistic: the type may have been created by Skopas: plate. 6. Mommsen: three inscriptions of Pozzuoli. 7. Huelsen:

epigraphic miscellanea: inscriptions of L. Minucius Natalis, of the equestrian statue of Domitian, and of a gladiatorial tessera. C. S.

*The same.* 1888. Part 2.

1. Heydemann: (i) a marble relief in Florence, representing the death of Priam at the altar of Zeus Herkeios: it bears a Roman sepulchral inscription of the end of the second century, A.D.: but the sculpture from its style recalls the frieze of Phigaleia, and may have been copied from one or more of the metopes of the Heraeum: in any case, it is Greek work, the fragment of a Trojan cycle of the fourth or end of the fifth century B.C. (ii) representations of the death of Priam on vases; two main types, viz. *a.* The Arktinos legend, where Priam *a.* is sitting, *B.* lies dying, on the altar, spared by Neoptolemos: and *b.* (more usual) which unites the death of Priam and of Astyanax: *a.* Priam sits supplicating Neoptolemos who swings Astyanax by the feet against him: *B.* the same, but Priam lies dying or dead: in *aa.* and *ba.* the altar has one volute; in the other scenes, it has none. In *b.* the action of Neoptolemos is intended to kill both victims at once, not, as has been thought, to dash Astyanax against the altar or from the fortress: plate, and five cuts. 2. Wolters: the busts of the Villa Ercolanese probably had the names in antiquity painted on the base: part of one of these inscriptions is still visible, on the bust of an armed man, and in spite of the armour, has always been read as Archimedes: it should however be Archidamos: of the four kings of Sparta so named, it must be the third, two of whose portraits Pausanias saw at Olympia: it is difficult to say what special interest this king had for the owner of the Villa. 3. Mau: excavations at Pompeii: in 1886 were discovered a series of sepulchres on both sides of the Via Nucerrina, a road which appears to have been abandoned, possibly after the destruction of the Stabian bridge (to which it led) in 63. They are certainly of early Imperial times and throw an interesting light upon Roman sepulchral customs, their transition between inhumation and incineration, and the influence each custom had on the other. This point is further illustrated by another tomb, of the time of Augustus, close by the Herculanean gate. A list of the inscriptions (graffiti and painted) found on the sepulchres outside the Herculanean gate: most of them, as in Pompeii, consist of electoral programmes: two are gladiatorial, and one relates to the finding of a strayed mare: one cut. 4. Huelsen: notes on the architecture of the temple of Capitoline Jove: in the Uffizi collection at Florence are two ancient drawings; the one of part of a column found in 1545: the other (facsimile on pl. V.) of part of a cornice, by Antonio of Sangallo the elder who died in 1534. 5. Barbini: notes on the excavations of Grosseto in the summer of 1886. C. S.

*The same.* 1888, part 3.

1. Duemmler: fragments of b.f. vases from Kyme in Aeolis: these fragments were excavated in 1880 and are now in a private collection in Smyrna: they represent on one side a dance of Seileni and nymphs, on the other, riders: the style, which is early Ionic, approaches nearest to the Klazomenae sarcophagi, and represents a middle stage between these sarcophagi and Attic vases: the band of animals however reminds us of the so-called Tyrrhenian vases. A list is given of fourteen Caere vases which are nearly allied, and are certainly all one fabric, probably not later than 550 B.C.: everything about them points to an Ionic origin; the ornament seems Rhodian; the representations show traces of Egyptian influence, which point to an Eastern Ionic town, like Samos, in

commercial relations with Egypt. In Italy they gave rise to a local fabric (a list of fourteen examples here given). He concludes that either (i) the Caere vases come from Phokaea, whose relations with Naukratis explain the traces of Egyptising influence: the local Italian fabric is the decadence of this style: or (ii) the Kyme fragments are importations from Phokaea, in which case the Caere vases represent an offshoot of this style in the Naukratite colony: one plate, ten cuts. 2. Mau: excavations at Pompeii: (i) in Insula viii, 2, the row of houses on the southern border of the town, which extends from the triangular forum towards the basilica and the house called 'di Championnet': and (ii) in Insula xi, 7, east of the house called 'del Centenario': the palestra of a small bathing establishment had the walls decorated with paintings representing athletes, among them two apoxomeni, a diskobolos, &c.: four cuts and a plan. 3. Huelsen: the site and the inscriptions of the Schola Xantha in the Forum Romanum: plate. 4. The same: note on the double names of slaves and liberti of the Imperial house, with list.

*Miscellanea.* Six: note on the Luynes vase inscription of Kleophrades. Petersen: on the theatre of Taormenion. Rohl: the representation of a dolmen in a Pompeian painting. C. S.

*Revue des Études Grecques.* 1888, part 1. Paris.

1. Babelon: *Aba* in Caria, one cut. 2. Chronique, by T. R., (i) excavation: (ii) sculpture and pottery: (iii) numismatics: (iv) epigraphy.

*The same.* Part 2.

1. Monceaux: Legend and history in Thessaly: an attempt to classify the myths under the heads of the different races that had their origin or resided in early times in Thessaly; thus, the Pelasgi, the four Hellenic tribes, and the Thessalians. 2. Croiset: the veracity of Herodotus: an answer to Sayce: the denial of his visit to Babylonia rests on errors of text: the point as to the destruction of the temple of Bel by Xerxes rests on no proof: it is absurd to argue that he did not sufficiently praise the monuments of Thebes: while Strabo and Arrian show that a considerable city existed upon Elephantine, and therefore Herodotus might well call it a city instead of an island. 3. Th. Reinach: the names on Athenian coins of the Macedonian period are those of the two chief Strafegoi, not, as Corsini thought, the archons, nor, as is generally supposed, financial officers like the viri monetales of Republican Rome. C. S.

*Arch.-Epig. Mittheilungen aus Oesterreich.* 1888, part 1. Vienna.

1. Kenner: Roman bars of gold with stamped impressions, found on the Bodza near Czofalva (Siebenburgen), where a rich gold treasure was found in 1840: the stamped inscriptions bear (i) the name of the tester (exactor auri), who marks them as pure gold of the first quality (obryzum primae notae): (ii) the name of another official who attests the genuineness of the first (probavit signum ad digma): (iii) the names of two citizens of Sirmium. Besides these, are stamped reliefs, either three busts of emperors, with *D(ominorum) N(ostorum)*: or a seated figure, the personification of the town Sirmium. These emperors must be Valens, Valentinian, and Gratian, so that the date must be 367-75: certain symbols in the field, a monogram of Christ, palm-branch, &c., enable us to identify individual years. The bars were no doubt used as current exchange: two plates. 2. Bulic: a bronze statuette of Zeus from Salona. 3. v. Domaszewski: a second manu-

script of Boghetich's Inscriptions of Salona (died 1784): a copy was possessed by Lanza, but is now lost. 4. Reichel: notes on the François Vase, of which the new tracing (*Wien. Vorleg.* N. S. ii. iv.) was lately executed under his supervision. 5. Klein: adduces a passage of Isaios (viii. 20) in defence of his rendering of Paus. v. 25, 13 (see *ante*, vol. xi. (1887), p. 204) as against Ulrich's *Beiträge*, p. 4. 6. Gomperz: the earliest Attic state record, the decree respecting the settlement of Athenian cleruchi in Salamis, can now be more accurately read, owing to Lolling's discovery (*Arch. Δελτιον*, June, 1888) of a new fragment which settles the length of the lines: a translation is here given: the lines are coloured alternately red and blue. 7. v. Domaszewski: further notes on the stamped gold bars. 8. Kenner: the same. 9. Szanto: restores an Amorgos inscription relating to a state loan, by comparison with a similar inscription (in *Bull. de Corr.*, viii. 23). 10. Hula: a metrical inscription from Lagina (*Bull. de Corr.*, xi. p. 160, no. 70) emended. 11. Kubitschek: Latin inscriptions from Oedenberg (Scarabantia). C. S.

*Bulletin de Correspondance Hellénique.* December, 1888. Athens and Paris.

1. Diehl: Byzantine paintings of Southern Italy: the wall paintings of grottoes with sacred subjects, of the xiith to xivth centuries: four plates. 2. Latyschew: new transcript of the Mykonos decree relating to sacrifices (*Αθήναιον* II, p. 235 foll.) with emendations. 3. Homolle: base of a statue in the temenos at Delos, inscribed with an archaic dedication by an artist of Naxos, Iphikartides: the statue was that of a nude man with left leg advanced, a common type at Naxos: on the base are two masks, Gorgoneia, and the head of a ram, appropriate to Apollo: from the types of these, and for epigraphical reasons, the base may be assigned to the beginning of the sixth or end of the seventh century B.C.: it is therefore the earliest known signature of an artist: plate. 4. Deschamps and Cousin: inscriptions from the temple of Zeus Panamarios: among them is a large series recording dedications of the hair: in the temple was placed a stone stele, with a cavity on one face containing the hair, and bearing a dedicatory inscription: this custom is modified according to the circumstances of the dedicatory, and is a religious oblation, not merely a sign of mourning: it obtained in many places in ancient Greece, as in Islam: but here it is peculiar

that there are no women's names, the same person dedicates more than once, the dedication is made to Zeus, and slaves may participate in it: it looks as if these dedications were the act of those initiated in the komyria, to which women were not admitted, and are probably the relic of a Carian custom: list of inscriptions: one cut. 5. Pottier: archaic vases with reliefs: recent discoveries testify to the very early existence in Greece of pottery with reliefs: specimens are also found in the islands and in Assyria: the Italian potters initiated in this ware Greek models, and it lasted down to the fifth century, strongly influenced by the East: two cuts. Holleaux: discovery in the church of Karditza, of a stele inscribed with (i) the circular addressed by Nero to the Greeks, bidding them meet Nov. 28 (67?) at Corinth, (ii) the official text of Nero's speech at Corinth, and (iii) the decree voted by Acraephiae in honour of Nero.

C. S.

*American Journal of Archaeology*, 1888, vol. iv. No. 3. Boston.

1. Editorial: the relation of the *Journal* to American archaeology. 2. Ramsay: Antiquities of Southern Phrygia and the border-lands (continued). iii. D. Phrygo-Pisidian frontier. E. The route of Manlius. A. Phrygia. 4. Clarke: Gargara, Lamponia, and Pionia; towns of the Troad: three cuts.

Note by Ramsay on his article above: news and summaries. C. S.

*Revue numismatique*, Quatrième trimestre, 1888. E. Babelon. 'Marathus.' Gives a descriptive list (with one Plate) of the coins of Marathus and discusses the dates and types. Babelon shows that the era employed cannot be the Aradus era (B.C. 259 or 258) as hitherto supposed. He considers that the coins are dated according to the Seleucid era, B.C. 312. It is suggested that the common reverse-type at Marathus of a youthful male figure seated on shields and holding an acrostolium and a plant is a representation of the Demos, or, rather, of Marathus, an eponymous hero.—E. Taillebois. 'Contremarques antiques.' A description of countermarks, chiefly on Roman denarii.—The 'Chronique' mentions the finding at Vertault (Côte-d'Or) of a bronze die of a coin of Tiberius.—Review: Podschivalow's 'Monnaies des rois du Bosphore cimmérien,' by Th. Reinach.

W. WROTH.

## SUMMARIES OF PERIODICALS.

*American Journal of Philology.* Vol. IX. 2. No. 34.

On the stylistic effect of the Greek Participle, B. L. Gildersleeve. Prof. G. maintains on the authority of Hermogenes and Aristides that *πλαγιασμός* (oblique construction) was first confined to the gen. absol., and then extended to the partip. in construction, but never went beyond it so as to include any subordinate clause as Prof. Weil thinks. *πλαγιασμός* connoted *περιβολή* (the comprehension of a number of notions in one sentence) and *σεμνότης*. Exx. of the rhetorical effect of *πλαγιασμός* are given, chiefly from the orators, and there is appended a table by Dr. G. Lodge, showing statistics of parteps. in the three tragic poets and their proportion in trimeter (including trochaic tetrameter), anapaestic and lyric verse respectively.—The sequence of tenses in Latin, supplementary paper, W. G. Hale, continued from *A. J. P.*

VIII. 1. The writer answers some criticisms of Prof. Gildersleeve (*A. J. P.* VIII. 2) on his previous paper, and, repeating his conclusion that 'the tenses of the subordinated subjunctives are expressive, not mechanically dictated by a preceding verb,' i.e. that the tenses of the subj. have an absolute as well as a relative temporal value, he endeavours to strengthen his case by further exx. According to the 'rule' of the sequence of tenses the aor. (perf.) in the subj. is an exception as it follows not a secondary but a primary tense. Prof. Hale maintains that the aor. is neither a primary nor a secondary tense, but it views the past from the present, and in sentences where an aor. (perf. subj.) after a main primary tense is followed by an imperf. subj. it forms 'the bridge of passage from one temporal scene to another.' The tenses of the indic. bear the same relation to the tenses of the subj., whether in independent sentences or in sentences

composed of main and subordinate clauses, that the tenses of the indic. bear to one another in both those classes of sentences.—*Gerunds and Gerundives in Pliny's Letters*, S. B. Platner. There are 130 cases of the use of the gerundive and 153 of the gerund but no marked fondness for any particular construction except that of the gen. of the gerund, after the six words *causa, tempus, ratio, jus, necessitas* and *studium*. This construction is about twice as frequent in Pl. as in Tac. *Ann.* On the other hand the dat. of the gerundive and subst. in a final sense, though common in Tac. *Ann.*, is rare in Pliny.—*Usener's Epicurea* (B. L. G.): 'the fruit of many years of labour, and that the labour of a great master.' There are also brief mentions of Mahaffy's *Greek Life and Thought*, Burn's *Roman Literature in relation to Roman Art*, von Essen's *Index Thucydideus*, and Gow's *Companion to School Classics*.

Vol. IX. 3. No. 35, *Enoch of Ascoli's MS. of the Elegia in Maecenatem*, Robinson Ellis. Mr. Ellis gives the peculiar readings of this MS. In 62 he emends *Bacche puer, pura*, for *Bacchea purpurea*, and *inter alia* approves 107 *parens* of this MS. for *paveus*, and in 148 the correction *Drusi...diem for Bruti...fidem*.—Recent Platonism in England, Paul Shorey. A hostile criticism of the interpretation of Plato's metaphysics by Mr. Jackson in his papers in *Journ. Phil.*, 'Plato's later theory of Ideas,' and by Mr. Archer-Hind (whom the writers considers as a follower of J.) in his edition of the *Timaeus*. It is maintained that no such development is to be found in Plato who 'belongs to the thinkers whose thought is first revealed to us in its maturity,' and that e.g. in the latter part of the *Parmenides*, there is not, as J. thinks, a distinctive class of εἶδη discriminated for the sake of a later theory. This is pursued in detail and the conclusion drawn, 'the chief objection to the theory in the mind of a genuine Platonist will always be the ever-strengthening impression of essential unity which the Platonic dialogues make upon repeated perusals.' Other papers are to follow.—*On certain corruptions in the Persae of Aeschylus*, A. E. Housman. 146. read Δαρειογενής | γένος ἡμέτερόν τε πατρώνιμον, 163. θυμὸν for μῦθος, and in 164 στρατός for πλοῦτος after Rauchenstein. 273. ἦλθε γαίης for ἦλθ' ἐπ' αἶαν, reading δάαν in next line. 278. πλάγ' ἐν σπιδάδεσσιν. 292. τὸ μήτ' ἐλέγξει. 451. ἐξωβολατο. 665. καὶνὰ γῆ, for καὶνὰ τε: cf. Eum. 803 where we should read γαίᾳ τῇδε μὴ for τε τῇδε γῆ of MSS. 815. κρηνὶς ἀπείσβη' for κρηνὶς ὑπέστιν and reading ἐκπιδέεται. 850. ἐμποδὼν for the unmetrical ἐμὲ παιδί for which παιδ' ἐμὲ is usually read, cf. Eur. I. T. 758 where ἐμποδὼν should be read for ἐμπεδον. E. G. Sihler has the foll. notes: Hdt. VIII. 124, a word such as ἀνδραγαθὺς to depend on ἀριστήϊα has dropped out before Εὐρυβιάδῃ. Din. c. Dem. 28, omit οὗτος after second μισθωτός. Din. c. Aristog. § 15, read τοιοῦτον for τοῖς τοῦτον, Din. c. Aristog. 15, insert οὐδὲν after οὐδεπώποτε. Plut. Lycurg. 13, 5, transpose πολλὰκίς to follow κωλύουσιν. Xen. Anab. I. 10, 10, δτε has dropped out after ὥσπερ and in ib. I. 9, 10, φίλους may have dropped out after ποτε, ib. III. 2, 34, read προσδεῖν μοι δοκεῖ or προσδεῖν δοκεῖ μοι for προσδοκεῖ μοι. In Thuc. VII. 43, 2, C. F. Smith proposes to translate παρασκευὴν τοξενμάτων 'force of archers' and not 'supply of arrows,' as Jowett does. Dr. Theodor Zielinski, *Die Gliederung der altattischen Komödie* (M. W. Humphreys), 'a book destined to make an epoch in the study of the Greek drama,' see A. J. P. VIII. 2.—Roberts' *Introduction to Greek Epigraphy* (H. W. Smyth), while commending the book itself the reviewer considers it to be too much of a compilation, especially from Kirchhoff.—R. Ellis' *Fables of Aelianus* (W. Ashburner), 'Mr. E. has brought

to the task a perhaps unique combination of literary taste, palaeographical insight and knowledge of Late Latin usage.'—M. Rubensohn, *Crinagorae Mytilenaei Epigrammata* (Robinson Ellis), 'cannot profess to think these poems have yet been explained adequately.' There are also brief mentions of Meisterhans, *Grammatik der attischen Inschriften* (second edition); Blass, *Ueber die Aussprache der Griechischen* (third edition) King and Cookson's *Principles of Sound and Inflection in Greek and Latin*; and Gompertz's *Zur Zeitfolge Platonischer Schriften*.

#### Zeitschrift für das Gymnasial-Wesen, Nov. 1888.

H. J. Müller proposes the following emendations in Livy. In 22, 19, 7 omit *ad before naves*. In 33, 43, 9 Madvig omits *ad Etruriam*. Perhaps we can keep the words by inserting *tuendam* after them. In 44, 19, 5 read *mittite for mittive*.—*Handbuch der klassischen Altertumswissenschaft*, ed. Iwan Müller (O. Weissenfels). The eighth half-vol. contains sketch of the history of the peoples of nearer-Asia and Egypt to the time of the Persian wars by F. Hommel and then an account of Greek geography by H. G. Lolling with the first half of an appendix on the topography of Athens. The latter comprises all parts of the ancient world where Greeks dwelt. The first third of the sixth half-vol. contains an account of the Greek military system by A. Bauer who follows the historical development of the Greek states, but, considering the detail with which parts of the subject have been treated by Rüstow and Köchly, B.'s dissertation is shorter than might have been expected. The greater part of this half-vol. contains an admirable representation of Greek private-antiquities by Iwan Müller, who takes the Ionic-Attic branch as a type. It is not merely a collection of antiquarian matter, but gives a comprehensive view of Greek private life in all its parts. The ninth half-vol. contains the conclusion of the topography of Athens by Lolling, and next the main features of Greek political history by R. Pöhlmann. P. begins with the pre-Dorian time and concludes with the development of Greece under the influence of Rome. 'All is full and clear.' The same half-vol. also contains the geography of Italy and the Roman provinces by J. Jung and a sketch of Roman history down to Augustus by B. Niese. The eleventh half-vol. contains Mathematics, Physical Science (including Medicine) and Physical Geography by S. Günther and concludes with a noteworthy History of Ancient Philosophy by W. Windelband. More space might however have been given to Zeno and Epicurus. R. Lange in a note on *agri decumates* (Tac. Germ. 29) says there is nothing to show it meant *titheland* or if so that it was a regular name for the district in question. In any case it only applied to the first cent.

The December and January numbers contain nothing important to readers of *Classical Review*.

#### Kuhn's Zeitschrift, xxx. 4. 1888.

1. G. Hatzidakis on the vocalism of modern Greek.  
—2. K. F. Johansson on the formation of the feminine in Indo-Germanic languages—concluding that the original language possessed two classes of derived feminines (a) with nom. -(i)ā, gen. -(i)ās from masc. stems in -(i)ō with fixed accent (b) with nom. -o or -ā, gen -ās from consonantal i- and u- stems with a movable accent. The feminines of the second type formed from i- stems (uom. -is (-i) or -ia gen -iās became even in I.E. the common type; the others of class (b) are rarely found, and in the individual languages class (b) for the most part coincides with class (a), 3. Johansson, *Miscellanea. κμέλεθρον* (Ety. Mag.) beside μέλαθρον go back to I.E. (s)kmele- and (s)kmele-



respectively and these to a common base *skeme-* the asigmatic form keeping the guttural. Similarly *σῶμα* is I.E. *skōmān* gen. *smētēs* I.E. *psama-* beside (p)*psma-* produces *ψάματος* and *σμάθος* which is reformed as *\*σάματος*, *ἄματος* (cf. *ψῆν* and *σμήν*), *ἔμπελος* goes with *ἀγκύλος*—*callis* for *caldis* with Germ *holz*. *silex*, old Bulg. *skala* for *scilex* with disimilation of guttural (cf. *siliqua*) goes with *calx* from an earlier (s)*kāl-k-* gen *skl-kēs* [Why ?]. In a paper on Germ. *-mr-* he incidentally shows that Lat. *mr* becomes *-br-*, e.g. *hibernus* = *him-rinos* (*χειμερινός*). The number ends with a discussion on the question of priority of discovery in Keltic philology between Professor Strachan of Manchester and Professor Zimmer of Greifswald.

**Mémoires de la Société de Linguistique**, tome vi. fasc. 5. (completing the volume).

L. Duvaud reproduces a Latin-German glossary of the 11th century from the Vatican Library.—V. Henry, *Mélanges Étymologiques* (contd.). 8. The accent

in Greek declension, to establish the law that 'if two cases of a system have originally the same vocalism in the last syllable and a different accent, the accents are assimilated, provided that in a parallel system the two corresponding cases have a different accent and a different final vowel.' 9. The 3rd. plural of the Indo-European perfect, 10. *ἄφαρ* = *σπ-δhr-t* with final *t* as in Sk. *sakti*. 11. *μψ* connected with *μεμφομαι*. 12. *μοx* = Sk. *maksā* √ *meγ-*; *vix* is the nom. of *vicem*, so that *vix ea fatus erat* = (it was) an immediate sequence; he had spoken, when... 13. *οδ* = Sk. *ava*, Latin *au-fero*.—M. Bréal, *ἴσταμαι* is formed from *πῆναι* etc. on the analogy of *ἵσταμαι*.—Ph. Berger on a Phoenician inscription at Piræus.—L. Parmentier on the origin of the 2nd persons in *-σαι*, Latin *-re*.—Ch. Ploix on Latin verbs in *-co*.—M. Bréal. 1) Latin subjunctive in *-am*. 2) middle participles in Latin. 3) *vicinus* from adv. *veici*, Gk. *οίκου*. 4) *ἐνεκα*. 5) *invito*. F. Geo. Mühl 3) *frequens*. 4) prep. *am* in Romance languages, 5) *μέραι νόκτες*.

## LIST OF NEW BOOKS.

## ENGLISH BOOKS.

- Andrews and Stoddard's Latin Grammar*, revised by Henry Preble. 12mo. xxi, 453 pp. Boston. Houghton, Mifflin and Company.  
*Hatch* (E.) *Essays in Biblical Greek*. 8vo. pp. 306. Oxford. Clarendon Press. 10s. 6d.  
*Herodotus*. Book VI., *Erato*, with introduction, notes, and maps by E. S. Shuckburgh. 12mo. pp. 300. Cambridge Warehouse. 4s.  
*Hodgkin* (T.) *The Dynasty of Theodosius: or eighty years struggle with the Barbarians*. Post 8vo. pp. 238. Clarendon Press. 6s.  
*Lewis* (Ch. T.) *A Latin Dictionary for Schools*. Large 8vo. xii, 1191 pp. New York. Harper Brothers. Cloth \$5.50; sheep \$6.00.

- Livy*, Book XXI. By Marcus S. Dimsdale. 12mo. pp. 192. Cambridge Warehouse. 2s. 6d.  
*Lucretius*. *De rerum natura liber quintus*, edited, with introduction and notes, by J. D. Duff. 12mo. pp. 144. Cambridge Warehouse. 2s.  
*Pattison* (Mark). *Essays, collected and arranged by Henry Nettleship*. 2 vols. 8vo. pp. viii, 494 and 447. Clarendon Press. 24s.  
*Plato*, *The Republic of*. Book X. Edited as an introduction to the study of Plato's Philosophy, by B. D. Turner. Cr. 8vo. pp. 144. Rivington. 4s. 6d.  
*Xenophon*. *Anabasis*. Books IV. and V. with notes, life, and map by the Rev. J. F. Macmichael. New edition, revised by J. E. Melhuish. 12mo. pp. 76. Bell and Son. 1s. 6d. each.

## FOREIGN BOOKS.

- Aristotelis quae feruntur de plantis, de mirabilibus auscultationibus, mechanica, de lineis insecabilibus, ventorum situs et nomina, de Melisso*, Xenophane, Gorgia. 12mo. xxxiii, 224 pp. Leipzig. Teubner. 3 Mk.  
*Baedeker* (K.) *Greece, Handbook for Travellers*. With a panorama of Athens, 6 maps and 14 plans. 12mo. cxvi, 374 pp. Leipzig. Baedeker. Cloth. 10 Mk.  
*Baumgarten* (F.) *Ein Rundgang durch die Ruinen Athens*. Mit 10 Abbildungen. 8vo. vi, 83 pp. Leipzig. 2 Mk.  
*Berthelot* (A.) *Les grandes scènes de l'histoire grecque*. Moreaux choisis des auteurs anciens et modernes pour servir à l'histoire de la Grèce ancienne et moderne. 16mo. Paris. Hachette. 2f. 50.  
*Brandt* (H.) *Zur Erklärung des Sophokles*. 4to. 48 pp. Bernburg (Schmelzer). 50 Pfg.  
*Brunn* (H.) *Geschichte der griechischen Künstler*. 2<sup>te</sup> Aufl. Lfg. 2-18. 8vo. i, pp. 49-384. ii, pp. 1-432. Stuttgart, Ebner und Seubert. Each 1 Mk.  
*Cattaneo* (C. I.) *De perobscuro T. Livii loco: brevis disceptatio*. Albenga, tip. T. Craviotto. 16mo. pp. 23.

- Catullo*. *Le poesie, tradotte da M. Rapisardi*. Napoli. Pierro. 16mo. pp. 143. 2 lire.  
*Christ* (W.) *Geschichte der griechischen Litteratur bis auf die Zeit Justinians*. Mit 21 Abbildungen. [Handbuch der klass. Altertums-Wissenschaft, VII.] 8vo. xi, 664 pp. Nördlingen, Beck. 12 Mk.  
*Cogliolo* (P.) *Storia del diritto privato romano dalle origini all'imperio*. Volume I. Firenze, Barbera, 1889. 16mo. 274 pp. 2 lire. Contains: 1. Le condizioni sociali e politiche di Roma. 2. Le fonti del diritto. 3. Ordinamento giudiziario e procedura civile.  
*Demosthenis orationes ex recensione G. Dindorfii*. Vol II. *Orationes XX-XL*. Editio IV correctior curante F. Blass. Editio maior. 12mo. cl, 508 pp. Leipzig, Teubner. each 2.40 Mk.  
— Editio minor. 12mo. Leipzig. Teubner. Each 1.50.  
*Gerhard* (E.) *Etruskische Spiegel*. Band V. Bearbeitet von K. Klügemann und G. Körte. Heft 8 and 9. 4to. pp. 89-112, with 20 plates. Berlin, Reimer. Each 9 Mk.  
*Gomperz* (Th.) *Ueber die Charaktere Theophrast's*.

- [Extr. 'Sitzungsber. der k. Akad. d. Wissensch.']  
8vo. 20 pp. Wien, 1888. Tempsky. 50 Pfg.
- Horace. Oeuvres. Edition Classique, avec notice et commentaires en français par F. Dübner.* 18mo. xxiv, 546 pp. Paris, Lecoffre.
- Erklärt von A. Kiessling. Teil 3. Briefe. 8vo. 295 pp. Berlin, Weidmann. 3 Mk. (Complete 8.25).
- Immerwahr. Die Lakonika des Pausanias, auf ihre Quellen untersucht.* 8vo. 150 pp. Berlin. Mayer und Müller. 3 Mk.
- Jahrbuch des kaiserlichen deutschen archäologischen Instituts. Ergänzungsheft 1. Die Calenderbilder der Chronographen vom Jahre 354, herausgegeben von I. Strzygowski.* 30 plates. vii, 106 pp. 4to. Berlin: G. Reimer. Boards. 30 Mk.
- Kampen (A. v.) Tabulae maximae quibus illustrantur terrae veterum, in usum scholarum descriptae. Tabulae I et IV. Chromolith. Folio. Gotha, Perthes. 18 Mk. I. Graecia. Scale: 1. 375,300. 9 sheets, 8 Mk. IV. Imperium Romanum. Scale: 1: 3,000,000, 12 sheets. 10 Mk.*
- Lacour-Gayet (G.) Antonin le Pieux et son temps. Essai sur l'histoire de l'empire romain au milieu du IIe siècle (138—161). Thèse.* 8vo. xxviii, 499 pp. Paris. Thorin. 12 fr.
- Lemercier (A. P.) De Platonis Phaedro dialogus.* 8vo. 75 pp. Nancy, Impr. Sordollet.
- Livy. Ab urbe condita libri XXVI—XXX. Texte latin publié avec une notice, des notes critiques et explicatives, des remarques sur la langue, un index des noms propres, des cartes et des gravures d'après les monuments par M. Riemann et M. Homolle.* 12mo. Boards. 2 fr. 75.
- Luchs (A.) de Horati carm. II. 6. commentatio.* 4to. 19 pp. Erlangen, Blaesing. 1 Mk.
- Marquardt (J.) Organisation de l'empire romain; traduit de l'allemand, par Weiss et Louis-Lucas. Tome I.* 8vo. xii, 335 pp. Paris, Thorin. 10 fr.
- Matzat (H.) Römische Zeitrechnung für die Jahre 219 bis 1 vor Christus.* 4to. viii, 300 pp. Berlin, Weidmann. 16 Mk.
- Noeldeken, Die Abfassungszeit der Schriften Tertullian's; de Boor, C., Neue Fragmente des Papias, Hegesippus und Pierius in bisher unbekannten Excerpten aus der Kirchengeschichte des Philippus Sidetes.* 184 pp. 6 Mk. [Extr. Gebhardt und Harnack Texte und Untersuchungen V. 2].
- Ovid. Carmina selecta, für den Schulgebrauch herausgegeben von J. Golling.* 12mo. xviii, 230 pp. Wien, Holder. 1 Mk. 50.
- Paape (C.) de C. Mario quaestiones selectae. Dissertatio inauguralis historica.* 4to. 49 pp. Königsberg (Koch). 1 Mk.
- Pellissou (M.) Rome sous Trajan. Religion, administration, lettres et arts.* 8vo. Paris. Degorce. 2 fr.
- Petrina (H.) Polychromie-Ornamentik des klassischen Alterthums. Ein Vorlagenwerk. Theil I. Lieferung 4. Large 4to. plates. Troppau, Buchholz und Diebel, each 8 Mk.*
- Priscillianii quae supersunt, maximam partem nuper detexit adjectisque commentariis criticis et indicibus*

- bus primus ed. G. Schepss. Accedit Orosii commentorium de errore Priscillianistarum et Originistarum.* 8vo. Vienna, Tempsky. xlvii, 223 pp. 8 Mk. 50. (Corpus script. eccl. lat. xviii.)
- Reisen im südwestlichen Kleinasien. Band II. Reisen in Lykien, Milyas und Kibyrtis. Ausgeführt auf Veranlassung der oesterreichischen Gesellschaft für archäologische Erforschung Kleinasiens. Beschrieben und herausgegeben von E. Petersen und E. von Luschan. Mit 40 Tafeln und zahlreichen Illustrationen im Text. Folio vi, 248 pp. Vienna, Gerold's Sohn. Boards. 150 M.*
- Scholia in Sophoclis tragoedias vetera. E codice Laurentiano denuo collato ed., commentario critico instruxit indices adiecit P. N. Papageorgius.* 8vo. xviii, 532 pp. Leipzig, Teubner. Mk 4.80.
- Seger (J.) Byzantinische Historiker des 10. und 11. Jahrh. I. Nikephoros Bryennios. Eine philologisch-historische Untersuchung.* 8vo. iv, 129 pp. München, Lindauer. Mk. 3.
- Stock (M.) de Vitruvii sermone. De formis enuntiatorum temporalium. Dissertatio inauguralis philologica.* 8vo. 40 pp. Berlin. Mk. 1.20.
- Tartara (A.) I precursori di Cicerone: considerazioni sullo svolgimento dell' eloquenza presso i Romani. Pisa, tip. T. Nistri e Cia. 4to. 239 pp. Contents: 1. Dalla fondazione della repubblica ad Appio il Cieco. 2. Da Appio il Cieco a Catone il Maggiore. 3. Dalla Morte di Catone all' esordire di Cicerone.*
- Theognis. Elegie e sentenze tradotte in endecasillabi sciolti italiani (carmi e pensieri morali e politici), per A. Arrò. Alba, tip. eredi Sansoldi. 8vo. viii, 90 pp.*
- Thuot (J. B.) Les ruines romaines de la forêt de Chabrières.* 8vo. 16 pp. (Extr. Mém. de la Soc. des sciences nat. et arch. de la Creuse).
- Tomaschek (W.) Kritik der ältesten Nachrichten über den skythischen Norden. II. Die Nachrichten Herodot's über den skythischen Karawanenweg nach Innerasien. [Extr. 'Sitzungsberichte der kaiserlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften']* 8vo. 70 pp. Wien, Tempsky. 1 Mk. 20. [I und II. 2 Mk. 20.]
- Weisshäupl (R.) Grabgedichte der griechischen Anthologie.* 8vo. vi, 112 pp. Vienna, Gerold's Sohn. 5 Mk. [Extr. Abhandl. d. arch. epigr. Seminars d. Univ. Wien herausgeg. von Benndorf und Bormann. VII.]
- Werner (R.) De L. Annaei Senecae Hercule, Troadibus, Phoenissis quaestiones. Dissertatio inauguralis.* 8vo. 54 pp. Leipzig, (Fock). Mk 1.
- Wieseler (F.) Archäologische Beiträge. Abtheilung I. Ueber einige Antiken in Regensburg, namentlich eine Bronzestatuetten des Mercurius.* 1 plate. [Extr. 'Abhandlungen der königlichen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen.'] 4to. 40 pp. Göttingen, Dieterich's Verl. 2 Mk.
- Zahn (Th.) Geschichte des neutestamentlichen Kanons. Band I. Das Neue Testament vor Origenes. Hälfte I.* 8vo. v, 452 pp. Erlangen, Deichert. 12 Mk.

DAVID NUTT, 270 STRAND.

# STUDIES ON THE LEGEND OF HOLY GRAIL,

WITH

Especial Reference to the Hypothesis of its Celtic Origin.

BY ALFRED NUTT.

Demy 8vo. xv. 281 pp. Cloth. 10s. 6d. nett.

*Fifty copies were printed for sale on stout paper; a few of these remain at 12s. 6d. nett.*

*Brief Summary of Contents.*—CH. I. Description of the leading forms of the Romance. CH. II. Summaries of the same (60 pages). CH. III. Determination of sequence and age of versions. CH. IV. Sketch of literature connected with the Grail cycle. CH. V. Analysis of the oldest forms. CHS. VI.—VIII. Comparison of the oldest forms with Celtic tradition. CH. IX. Hypothetical development of legend. CH. X. The moral and æsthetic ideals of the legend. APPENDICES. The relationship of Chrestien and Wolfram, the Brandan and Grail legends. INDICES. I. *Dramatis personæ*. II. Subject Index.

## EXTRACTS FROM PRESS NOTICES.

### The Athenæum.

These charming studies of the Grail legend consist in part of the author's own views of the origin of the legend and his reasoning in support of those views, and in part of a copious array of the data on which he builds, and on which other students may build for themselves if they disapprove of the structure which he has achieved in the work before us. . . . It is so much the fashion in this country nowadays to regard studies of this kind as the proper domain of German scholars, that one has almost to apologize for an Englishman who ventures to enter the arena. But it is needless to say that this is so simply because Englishmen are otherwise engaged, and not because they are less capable of dealing with such subjects, as is amply proved in the volume before us. We go even further and maintain that, on the whole, a question involving Celtic origins as against Teutonic is much more likely to receive impartial treatment in England than in either Germany or France with their fierce mutual antagonism. Traces of this national bias are only too evident in the works of several of the learned Germans criticized by Mr. Nutt, who holds the balance very carefully between the rival theories; but, as already indicated, the author himself accepts the theory of the Celtic origin of the Grail legend. Its history, according to him, is the history of the gradual transformation of old Celtic folk-tales into a poem charged with Christian symbolism and mysticism. This transformation, at first the inevitable outcome of its pre-Christian development, was hastened later, he thinks, by the perception that it was a fitting vehicle for certain

moral and spiritual ideas. . . . We have endeavoured to give some idea of the nature of Mr. Nutt's work and the sort of questions it discusses at length, together with one or two which it raises for future discussion. The book, besides being highly readable, is the most important contribution to the literature of the Grail legend which has been made for many years; and no student of mediæval romance or even of English literature can do without it. Lastly, it is provided not only with a good index of the ordinary kind, but also with one of the *dramatis personæ* of the Grail legend, with elaborate references to the texts containing them, and of the variants of the names behind which those *personæ* are provokingly fond of lurking.

### Literarisches Centralblatt.

Die Arbeit des Verf.'s ist gründlich genug, um fortan zu ihr Stellung nehmen zu müssen. Ref. ist allerdings nicht durch sie bekehrt worden, aber unleugbar ist, dass wir erst an der Schwelle einer gründlichen Kenntniss des keltischen Alterthums stehen, und dass wir bei fortschreitender Kenntniss in dieser Richtung wohl noch in die Lage kommen können, manche unserer Ansichten und Auffassungen umdenken zu müssen. Ein in so anständigem und gebildetem Tone geschriebenes Werk erleichtert das Eingehen auf die neu gebotenen Anschauungen nicht wenig.

### The Scots Observer.

Most modest and unassuming in its pretensions, claiming only to be a collection of "studies," disclaiming all pretence to be exhaustive or even orderly, starting with

an apology for the extent to which the author has been obliged to push conjecture, this book is nevertheless an achievement of profound erudition and masterly argument, and may be hailed as redeeming English scholarship from a long-standing reproach. English scholars have not hitherto joined seriously in the modern Quest of the Grail: the scholar's quest to know how the legends about the mystic Vessel, and the adventures occasioned by its pursuit, originated. The vast and intricate cycle of Arthurian romance was England's great contribution to mediæval literature; it had, at least, its local centre in Britain, and its development was probably encouraged by the patronage of the English Court. One might have expected English scholars therefore to be foremost in the modern investigation of the numerous fascinating problems that it offers for research. But the labour and self-denial, the prolonged and patient study, required of any adventurer on this toilsome literary quest, have been left hitherto to the learned men of France and Germany; and our scholars, like Percival on his first visit to the Grail Castle, have seen the Grail pass without asking why. . . . . If Mr. Nutt had done nothing more than discuss the age and relationship of the different versions, he would have rendered important service, so sound and exemplary is his method, and so convincing are his results. . . . . The patience and skill with which Mr. Nutt disentangles the fibres thus "inveterately convolved," without resorting to the axe of arbitrary dogma, is a model for work of the kind. He had no need to apologise for the amount of conjecture in his theories. There is conjecture and conjecture: Mr. Nutt's conjectures are not advanced without ground of probability being shown. He has as rigid a sense of the conditions of proof as Darwin himself; and he is not less patient in accumulating circumstances in favour of his hypothesis, nor less candid in acknowledging the existence of circumstances that tell the other way. . . . . Extreme probability is all that can be expected in such problems as Mr. Nutt has set himself to solve, and this much at least it seems to us, after carefully following his arguments, he has attained. We have not found an instance in which he has pushed an argument beyond its rational grounds. At every point he shows himself aware of the fragile nature of the only evidence attainable for one theory or another. His case rests upon the cumulative force of a multitude of circumstances, all pointing in one direction. And the concluding chapter,

in which he discusses the ethical value of the various versions of the Grail legend in our own century as well as in the twelfth, evinces the same sanity of judgment and sound common-sense. His remarks on Lord Tennyson's *Idylls* and Wagner's *Parsifal* are examples of criticism, broad-based on thorough knowledge and wholesome humanity, that should really be helpful to creative literature.

#### Le Moyen Age.

Il semble résulter des analogies, des références et des différences de tous ces textes que la légende arthurienne, telle qu'elle apparaît aux douzième et treizième siècles, a été formée par la contamination, la combinaison de la *haute histoire* et de la *Queste* proprement dite. . . . . Serrant de plus près le grand problème, notamment pour décider si le Graal appartenait primitivement à la forme originelle de la *Queste*, M. Nutt expose en toute loyauté scientifique les principaux systèmes imaginés par la critique moderne. Grâce à une *accuracy* qui dispense provisoirement de nombreuses lectures, on trouve dans ce chapitre IV. un exposé substantiel et lucide des conjectures arthuriennes de Hersart de la Villemarqué, de San-Marte, de Simrock, de Rochat, de Furnivall, de Halliwell, de Baring Gould, de Campbell, de Paulin Paris, de Charles Potvin, Bergmann, Hucher, Zarneke. Le développement le plus complet est accordé aux conjectures du Dr. Birch-Hirschfeld et aux objections soulevées par le Prof. Ern. Martin et W. Hertz, Otto Küpp et Alfred Nutt lui-même.

Celui-ci se prévaut, et à juste titre, de ses connaissances spéciales en mythologie ou folklore celtique. Ses études sur les formules préhistoriques de 'l'expulsion et du retour' ont révélé un celtiste assez familier avec les derniers progrès de la mythologie comparée. Les épisodes les plus bizarres, les détails les plus hétéroclites de la quête du Saint Graal semblent pouvoir s'expliquer par des survivances païennes, telles qu'on en trouve surtout dans les traditions irlandaises et les poésies ossianiques. Le château des Merveilles devient une localité d'Avalon et des Champs-Elysées; le graal ou l'écuelle sacrée n'est plus que le bassin bardique d'où l'on tire la science infuse ou qu'on *suce du doigt*, et quant au Roi Pêcheur dont les symbolistes catholiques ont fait de bonne heure le pêcheur des âmes, c'est Bran du Mabinogion, ou plutôt Cernunnos, ce *Dis* gaulois, Pluton des richesses d'outre-tombe. Comme dans le mythe de Proserpine, le silence et l'absten-



tion sont de toute rigueur primordiale. Plus d'une de ces incohérences si agaçantes dans les longs romans de la Table Ronde ne dérive que d'une prohibition magique à l'instar du *geasa* des anciens Irlandais ou du *tabou* des Polynésiens. Le caprice, la disparate, l'inconsistance, la contradiction qui nous heurte à chaque instant dans ce monde fantastique, ne choque plus dès qu'on découvre la logique populaire des mythes. L' inexplicable s'explique; car le vrai glossaire semble retrouvé.

#### Antiquary.

Mr. Nutt deserves special praise. He has rolled away a reproach from English scholarship; and, though he does not conceal his own leanings, he never allows them to interfere with the full and impartial setting forth of all that is to be said on all sides. . . . What then is the sum of Mr. A. Nutt's contention? Briefly this, that the Grail-story is made up of two elements, the heathen-Celtic and the Christian, as it is of two parts, the Grail-story and the Quest; that the former is mainly Christian, owing much to that "Gospel of Nicodemus" which very early got vogue in our island, while the latter is fundamentally a heathen story, of which "the great fool" in Celtic folk-lore is the popular form. And his thesis he has worked out with a thoroughness which few Germans could surpass. Even to those who are not deeply in love with the subject, the book may be recommended as a model of arrangement and method.

#### Revue Celtique.

M. Alfred Nutt vient de faire paraître le travail le plus complet qui ait été publié jusqu'à ce jour sur les sources primitives d'une des fables les plus importantes du cycle de la Table Ronde.

#### The Saturday Review.

A good study of The Graal legend has long been among the principal desiderata in mediæval literature. Its composition has been hitherto hindered partly by the fact that the texts have not been easily accessible, partly by the other fact that the students of them have for the most part been specialists in philology, not trained literary critics. . . . So Mr. Nutt had a very fine and wide field open to him. He has laboured in it with great skill, judgment, and care; and, though we happen to differ with him both in his general conclusion and in some minor points, we can congratulate him, with such authority as at least some years' reading of the printed texts—English, German, and French—can give,

on his performance. His plan is a thorough one, and well suited to a subject where the original authorities are not in every one's hands. He gives a general sketch of the texts which are considered to give the earliest account of the Graal legend. . . . Some familiarity with most, if not all, of these in the original enables us to pronounce his summaries excellent. Then Mr. Nutt attacks the general story (it may perhaps be advisable to mention, for the benefit of those who only know Arthurian legends through Mallory or his followers, that Arthur plays but a small part, or none at all, in the older Graal legends), and resolves it, rightly enough, into the story of the Quest and the legends about the Origin and Early History of the vessel. He holds, and here we think rightly, that, as so often happens, the chronologically earlier part of the legend is really the later, and invented as an afterthought for the sake of completeness. Then he gives a sketch of former handlings of the subject, and discusses the various romances in their dealings with the same or resembling parts of the story. And, having indicated his own ideas as to the origin of the legend, he finishes with a chapter, perhaps the most interesting of all, on the general import and character of the romances, the social and ethical conditions manifested in them, and so on.

#### The Catholic Press.

All who are interested in the subject will find Mr. Nutt's volume very useful. He is a scholar of a high type, and writes in a manner calculated to win respect.

#### The Oswestry Advertizer and Border Counties Herald.

Briefly noting the statements of the MSS. concerning their authorship, Mr. Nutt gives clear and detailed summaries of the most important versions, and then proceeds with the primary object of his investigation, viz. to determine as far as possible the age and relationship to one another of the different versions which have come down to us, to exhibit the oldest form of the story, as we have it, and to connect it with Celtic traditional belief and literature. How far he has succeeded in attaining this object I leave to readers more critical than myself to decide. Certain it is, however, that never before have these tales, first shaped as the author remarks, in a period of culture well nigh pre-historic, gifted by reason of their Celtic setting with a charm that commended them to the romantic spirit of the middle ages, and made them fit vehicles for the em-

bodiment of mediæval ideas, been treated with a criticism at once so masterly and sympathetic.

#### The Literary World.

Students of Arthurian legends, and of Celtic literature generally, will thank Mr. Nutt for his admirable summaries of the poems and romances in which the story of the Holy Grail has come down to us. Ordinary English readers have been made acquainted with it to some extent by the Poet Laureate, but Mr. Nutt puts us in possession of the legend as nearly as possible in the form in which it was told by the romancers of the twelfth century. . . . The volume shows not less critical acumen than patient research, and will be found a valuable aid in the interpretation of Arthurian romance.

#### Notes and Queries.

This is a work of sound scholarship. Whether we accept or deny the author's conclusions, it is impossible for any reader who is acquainted with even the outline of the subject not to feel grateful for the labour spent in endeavouring to clear up some of the difficult questions which surround the wonderful fable of the "holy grail." On a question so beset with difficulties it would be extremely rash for us to give a dogmatic decision. So far as we have evidence to go on, it would seem probable that we owe to the Celtic intellect this beautiful fable in its earlier forms.

#### The Artist.

Mr. Nutt's book is one which every student of literature, as well as all scholars who are interested in the Aryan mythology, should possess. . . . Altogether this book is an important addition to the literature of the subject; and when it is taken into consideration that this subject is, perhaps, the most beautiful, incontestably the most significant and spiritual legend in the Aryan storehouse, I can only conclude by urging every one to spend ten shillings in buying a copy of the work.

#### St. James's Gazette.

A work of scholarly research addresses itself to a comparatively limited circle of readers, and can only be deeply interesting to the specialist. The criticism, the historical research, and the collation of authorities have entailed much labour on the author. He is not himself satisfied with the form in which he has presented his work; and perhaps he might have made it an easier book to read without diminishing its solid value as a

book of reference. The "Studies," or such parts of them as are not purely historical, are devoted to a careful examination of the theory which derives an elevated Christian symbolism out of a pagan legend. . . . Mr. Nutt's learned and valuable essay is an important contribution to the history of popular legends.

#### Revue des Traditions Populaires.

'L'histoire de la légende de saint Graal est la transformation progressive de vieux contes populaires celtiques en un poème plein de symbolisme et de mysticisme chrétiens.' Tel est, selon les propres paroles de l'auteur (p. 227), le résumé de ce livre.

Cette théorie n'a rien d'imprévu pour nous, car depuis les travaux de M. de la Villemarqué, elle est classique en France. Mais jamais elle n'avait été démontrée avec une telle abondance d'arguments. Toute la littérature celtique a été fouillée par l'auteur et a dû fournir ses points de rapprochement et de similitude. Nous recommanderons particulièrement la lecture du chapitre VII. où M. Nutt recherche dans les vieux contes celtiques non seulement les diverses particularités de la *Queste* du Graal, mais encore l'historique des vases légendaires et des épées merveilleuses. Rien de plus clair d'ailleurs et d'une lecture plus attachante que l'ouvrage tout entier: dans les trois premiers chapitres, l'auteur catalogue les différents textes médiévaux relatifs au Graal, analyse ces textes, puis résume l'état actuel de la question; dans les six chapitres suivants, il recherche les origines des divers incidents de l'histoire de Perceval; enfin dans un dernier chapitre, il suit dans le monde moderne la fortune de la légende qu'il a vu naître dans le monde ancien.

Nous ne pouvons évidemment songer à analyser ici un aussi vaste travail. Les détails s'y ajoutent sans relâche aux détails et, sans les décrire les uns après les autres, il serait impossible de donner une idée de la valeur de l'ensemble.

#### Journal of American Folk-Lore.

Mr. Nutt's work is the first serious attempt of an English scholar to deal with the complicated problems connected with the origin and relations of the mediæval romances which treat of the Grail. Beside original discussions, he gives valuable summaries of these romances (pp. 8-64) and an elaborate bibliography of researches (pp. 97-126). The last chapter contains an examination of the story from an æsthetic point of view.

D. NUTT, 270 STRAND.